

WHO PARTICIPATES AND WHY:  
A CASE STUDY OF MODEL CITIES, CAMBRIDGE

by

Michael Witwer Price  
B.A. Yale University  
(1964)

Submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for  
the degree of  
Master of City Planning  
at the  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

June 1969

Signature of Author \_\_\_\_\_ Department of City Planning, May 23, 1969

Certified by \_\_\_\_\_ Thesis Supervisor

Accepted by \_\_\_\_\_ Chairman, Departmental Committee on Graduate Students



WHO PARTICIPATES AND WHY:

A CASE STUDY OF MODEL CITIES, CAMBRIDGE

by

Michael Witwer Price

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of City Planning  
at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
June 1969

Community Participation among poor people is the subject of lively discussion, but confusion results too often from lack of precise knowledge of who among the poor participates, who doesn't, and what effect structure has upon the rate of participation.

In order to develop some hypotheses concerning participation in poor neighborhoods, I settled upon a "qualitative research" method; that is, in-depth interviews of a limited number of residents of Model Cities, Cambridge. The respondents presented a range of types and reasons for participation or non-participation. From this I developed a typology of participation based upon two motivations -- those which were goal-oriented to an outer world, and those which were focused on psychic satisfaction.

Analysis of the interviews, so classified, led to certain hypotheses. The first and most fundamental is that poor people have low rates of participation for a rational reason: there is little expectation of success. Yet there are those who still participate and the evidence suggests that this is accounted for by the more immediate rewards offered by the process of participation, apart from goal satisfaction. Naturally, the numbers of people who will be attracted under such circumstances is limited. But even among this more limited group there were those who were discouraged from participating by the unsympathetic or unappealing nature of the structure. Thus, for any planner or other professional who hopes to elicit participation, some awareness of the various organizational structures which appeal to his particular target group is a necessity.

However, it is a final, if tentative, conclusion of this study that until the structures in question can summon the requisite power which can truly solve the problems of people in poor neighborhoods, participation will be limited to a small minority. For the same reasons, it raises questions about the viability of the professional in being of major help to his client, if that client be poor.

Thesis Supervisor: Lisa R. Peattie  
Title: Associate Professor  
of City Planning

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	Page...
A. Reasons for the Study	5
B. Methodology	10
C. Cambridge Model Cities as a Subject of Study	14
II. A Typology for Participation	19
A. Pure Types	21
B. Category Types	
1. "The True Participant" -- High internal motivation, High external motivation (Hi,Hx)	33
2. The Coffee Klatchers ( Hi, Lx): Politics as a Club.	52
3. The Dogged Goal Setter (Li, Hx)	56
4. Widening Horizons (Mi, Hx)	56
5. Middle America (Mi, Mx)	72
6. "All the World's A Stage" (Hi, Mx)	88
7. Potential Altruist (Li, Mx)	98
8. Non-Participants (Li, Lx)	101
III. Real versus Anticipated Response	110
IV. Other Groups Not Mentioned	126
V. Communication Patterns	129
VI. Conclusion	132
Appendix I	150
Appendix II	151
Bibliography	152

For Sabra



## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Reasons for the Study

Citizen participation has long been a touchstone of American democracy both in ideology and practice, observed by De Tocqueville and mythologized in fond references to the town meeting. But as the process of mythologizing suggests, its prevalence is not as assured as it once would seem to have been. The need for the myth connotes a lack of the practice. For many, the view of man and society upon which the enlightened philosophers developed their theories of government which De Tocqueville observed in America<sup>1</sup> has been rendered inadequate by the changes of scale inherent in modern society. A change in degree has wrought a change in kind:

The machine age has so enormously expanded, multiplied, intensified and complicated the scope of the indirect consequences, has formed such immense and consolidated unions in action, on an impersonal rather than a community basis, that the resultant public cannot identify and distinguish itself ... there are too many publics and too much of public concern for our existing resources to cope with.<sup>2</sup>

But many who have addressed themselves to this problem ascribe to the basic concept of participation and place renewed faith in it as a means of overcoming our most pressing problems. Particularly vocal proponents of this

---

1. "Every individual is always supposed to be as well informed, as virtuous, and as strong as any of his fellow citizens. He obeys the government not because he is inferior to those who conduct it, or because he is less capable than any other of governing himself, but because he acknowledges the utility of association with his fellow-men, and he knows that no such association can exist without a regulating force." -- Alexis De Tocqueville, Democracy in America, New York, Mentor Books, 1963, p. 58.

2. John Dewey, The Public and Its Problems, Chicago, Gateway Books, 1946, p. 126.

philosophy have been the planners and other professionals who are concerned with our urban life and the poor:

Probably no other issue is as vital to the success of solving America's urban crisis than the viable participation of urban residents in planning the neighborhoods and cities in which they live and the social programs which directly affect them. City dwellers are demanding to be heard. They want in -- they want to help control -- not only indirectly through their elected representatives in the councils of central government, but also on the block and neighborhood level.<sup>3</sup>

In part this attitude has been fostered by philosophic commitment; in part, the planners have endorsed it for pragmatic reasons: they can't get their work done without some token recognition of the idea; but it is a bothersome irrelevancy, best dismissed if possible:

The University of Chicago, the South East Chicago Commission Staff and their Planning Unit were, as described, committed to swift execution of renewal. Given their board support from institutional, economic, and political sources, they could afford to neglect local public relations in developing their plans<sup>4</sup>

Moreover, even among those who espouse the idea for more philosophic, less manipulative reasons, there is a split between those who see benefits stemming from the process -- participation as an act valuable for the educative function and for the sense of self it can engender, and those who see it more in terms of product -- that only with the citizen input can a feasible solution be achieved. To me such a dichotomy is not helpful; although there is a tension between the two, one cannot be sacrificed for the gain of the other. Unless both are present, I am dubious that either

---

3. Hans B. C. Spiegel, Citizen Participation in Urban Development, National Institute for Applied Behavior Science, Washington, D.C., 1968, Introduction.

4. Peter Rossi and Robert Dentler, The Politics of Urban Renewal, New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, p. 134. (Emphasis added.)

will be achieved. A good product cannot be realized without attention to the process, but the process by itself is sterile. The confusion, or bifurcation of the problem, exists because too little study has been given to the dynamics of participation as practiced, and that which has been done has dealt with mainly one type: participation in urban renewal programs, which is unusual in so many aspects as to generate little generalizable knowledge. (In essence it has led to a pessimism concerning the practicability of the poor participating in planning.) It seems that in discussion of participation it is assumed that participation is independent of the problem defined or the process which defines it; that a group such as "the poor" either will participate or they won't. Such simplification and confusion over the theory and practice is due, in part, to insufficient study as to who participates, and why they do, or don't. This leads necessarily to confusion when it comes time to structure an organization for participation. The questions for the organizer yet to be answered are manifold: Who will they attract under what circumstances, and what are the problems to anticipate? What effect do different types of participants have on a structure and program which calls for the involvement. What is the motivation which makes certain of the poor willing to participate in community affairs and others not? Is this a factor of class, or life style, or both? How much is determined by the form and structure of the organization eliciting support, its ability to solve some external problems, and to what degree would the participants continue their activities regardless of the structure, finding returns through processes unintended by the organizers? Do the poor only react

in time of crisis, when their very pattern of existence is at stake, or can they be organized to "plan for their community" on a long range basis? Do those who do not participate fail to do so because of apathy, lack of necessary skills, and indifference to their surroundings, or because of a reasoned evaluation of time, energy and probability of success? If it is a factor of both, to what degree, and can either element be changed? These questions are beyond the scope of this paper to settle in any way approaching conclusiveness. However, I wished to raise them and the best place to start seemed to be with the people around whom these questions revolved. The literature did not seem adequate; for me it would be more satisfying and hopefully more meaningful to hear individuals themselves speak about their participation or lack of it in community affairs. I started talking with people, and developed a survey schedule for the twenty-two interviews from which this work is drawn.

From this information, some hypotheses and operating principles are drawn which can be of use to planners and professionals who are interested in establishing, or working within a framework of citizen participation in low income neighborhoods.

Today anyone involved in research must be particularly sensitive to what ends his seemingly innocuous work may be put. I realize that for many participation is not seen as a good in itself, but as a means to ends, ends of which I do not approve. The manipulation of people to satisfy government requirements and be a cover for decisions already arrived at has been mentioned. Of this I do not approve. Nor do I approve of the

"pacification" value of participation which is recognized as a traditional rationale.

(It) serves to protect the elites who control and exercise this power. The latter ('elites') are particularly vulnerable to 'direct action' by 'masses' not tied to the political system through associations, that is, action organized on the basis of ideologies subversive of institutions underpinning the position of the 'elites' and feeding on anxieties of individuals living under conditions of social crisis.<sup>5</sup>

I would not like this study to contribute to the creation of a handbook on how to "co-opt the poor and maintain the status quo." But it is a central thesis of this study that the poor will not be easily misled; that they will not participate unless their needs, in some real sense, are met. As long as manipulation for ends other than their own is the motivating force behind the desire for participation, the poor will remain "apathetic," and wisely.

If my work can be used as a basis for some honest re-evaluation of the poor person's position and action in society, and help in the development of structures more responsive to this, I would be happy, for as Michel Crozier states:

One cannot directly modify values, much less the basic personality. However, the imperatives of action, the will to succeed, the advantages gained from eliminating pathological features from the system of organization on which one is dependent -- these can lead to a choice of structures, to the imposition of types of relations that will ultimately have repercussions in values and the basic personality.<sup>6</sup>

---

5. Murray Hausknect, The Blue Collar Joiner, in Blue Collar World, Shostak and Gomberg (eds.), Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, 1964, p. 207.

6. Michel Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964, p. 8.

B. Methodology

I am not particularly sympathetic to the criticism of case studies which says that while interesting they are of limited value because they can't be replicated. While situations do change, if the case has been presented adequately, an intelligent reader should be able to recognize the differences and similarities when looking at a new situation, and make the reformulation necessary to achieving some conclusions useful to him.

The impulse to the quantification of data was healthy and necessary, but it now may be somewhat limiting, as a dominant ideology. In dealing with the affairs of man there are some who still hold that a biography or autobiography, despite the uniqueness of every person, has merit beyond the objet d'art: that it can teach approaches and lay open problems that have pertinence for all of us. In the same way I feel a single case study does have generalized applicability, if the student has some modicum of acumen with which he absorbs or discards those pieces of information helpful to him in dealing with his particular reality.

This same type of criticism is leveled with even more vehemence at any work which purports to being scientific while relying on soft or qualitative data, such as in-depth interviews aim to do. Not being a statistically valid sample, there can be no attempt at representativeness in this study, but the range and possibilities of behavior it is hoped are established, as a series of characteristics, not of inevitable association of elements.<sup>7</sup>

---

7. Robert Weiss, "Issues in Holistic Research," reprinted from Institutions and the Person, Becker, et al (eds.), Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1968.

Being a study of a dynamic process, moreover, it cannot dare to be complete. Over time obviously the objective facts will change but, if the theory has value, the system and the reactions to it should maintain some consistency. With continued research the theory should be made more congruent with reality: additional data will alter the theory.

Thirty interviews were originally planned, ten from each of three groups selected to provide sufficient scope. Three groups were classified dependent upon the degree of participation. Full participants were those who attended the majority if not all public meetings of the Model Cities program, had some role in the early formation of the program, a position of responsibility on the present board, or, as in many cases, all. The second category included those of sporadic participation, participation defined more strictly as attendance at meetings; and third, the non-participants. After I had done twenty-two, however, I stopped interviewing and began to write, feeling that I had a sound sense of what I had found and what I could find, considering the limits imposed by time. The interviews planned but not done were for the most part from that group with which I had the greatest familiarity and sense of predictability -- the full participants. Although I had not interviewed all of them formally, most all of them were either acquaintances or friends, people with whom I had talked and could with some confidence anticipate the nature of their response. For that category of which I could speak with the least confidence -- the non-participants -- I came closest to completing in terms of original goals (eight out of the desired ten). I do not feel that this

is enough, nor would ten be. Numerically, this group represents by far the largest proportion of the total Model Cities area population, and thus there may be a greater range of the explanation of motivation. By the nature of qualitative research I expect that as more data is accumulated, certain premises here stated will be clarified and other areas left largely unexplained will begin to be sketched in.

The interview schedule was non-directed to the extent that, while areas or topics of discussion had been decided in advance, there was not a set order of specific questions. Nor were all areas covered with the same degree of depth. Certain persons had a great deal to say on certain subjects and little on others, and the nature of the interview, free discussion, allowed me to capitalize on this. The areas which I held in my own mind as they talked, and in which I did direct questions to these subjects were:

1. Initial awareness of the program patterns of communication;
2. History and type of previous involvement in community affairs;
3. Sense of efficacy in political terms;
4. Present view of program.

For the first two groups, full and sporadic participants, I drew mainly on my previous acquaintance, as one who had been a community organizer in the area, of the principal actors involved, supplementing this with their recommendations of likely people. For the third group, in some ways the most important and most difficult to contact in a way conducive to systematic patterning, I had to rely on chance: knocking on doors, stopping people in the street, or talking in shops and bars. The early interviews



were not as effective as later ones; I knew better both what to ask and how to ask it as I progressed. Some, as in the case of the woman who defined herself as an "old square" and was unalterably opposed to citizen control, lasted no more than 10 minutes; others were spread over a period of two and a half hours, complemented by food and drink. The average of the latter half of interviews was forty-five minutes to an hour.

Much of the information which found its way into this study extends beyond the interview schedule, a result of a year's observation first, working with many of the people and since last September, as a resident of the area. An area of information which I did not pursue, but which I feel would be fruitful is literature, other case studies of course, but also biography and even fiction. A question as wide as the determinants of participation can be researched in many modes of expression.

C. Cambridge Model Cities as a Subject of Study

The Model Cities area of Cambridge by federal definition has economic, physical and social problems characteristic of low-income neighborhoods. In a city whose housing stock is old (92.8% built before 1940)<sup>8</sup>, its share of dilapidated units is well above the city total.<sup>9</sup>

Population density is higher and 20% of the housing stock in the area is public housing.<sup>10</sup> These projects (3) "tend to provide a concentration of the social problems -- a fact which is viewed with suspicion by the home ownership elements of the remainder of the area."<sup>11</sup> This judgment was borne out in the interviews and has some determination on the participation, and on organizational conflict.

Within the area there is one urban renewal project (Wellington-Harrington), skirting Roosevelt Towers Housing Project, and there are two others on the Model Cities eastern boundary. This lends some credibility to the neighborhood's suspicion of city planning projects and the professionals connected with them. The projects previously were designed for commercial and office development, not housing, which is the primary problem of the area. The

---

8. Gail Malefant, (ed.), The New Citizen's Guide to Cambridge.

9. cf. Appendix I for a summary of data.

10. Application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Model Cities Planning Grant, Cambridge, 1967, p. 17.

11. Ibid., p. 28.

proximity of M.I.T., which is expanding, adds to the objective problem of housing, as well as contributing to the psychological fear and resentment of the professional.

Socially the most noticeable statistic is the high percentage of elderly on welfare (20.9% as opposed to 11.4% for the city as a whole).<sup>12</sup> This has consequences for participation and should be accounted for by those who would compare the findings of this study with that of another community. The Model Cities area of Cambridge has a high concentration of ethnic groups -- Portuguese, Polish, Lithuanian, Greek, Irish, Italian and Negro -- groups attracted by the industries in the area offering employment. The presence of ethnic enclaves raises the question of whether the Model Cities area can be referred to as a community or a neighborhood. It certainly is not a community as defined by an area in which the members commonly identify as a geographic, social or political unit. As the application states: "a case can be made for the fact that this Model Cities<sup>13</sup> area consists of two, three or even four recognizable neighborhoods." The residents themselves use the classification basis of the Cambridge Planning Board -- Neighborhood 3 and Neighborhood 4, and at least one respondent questioned the wisdom of grouping them together as a Model City area:

As you must have noticed by now, there is no earthly reason for Area 3 and 4 to be put together as the Model Cities -- they are entirely different and there is animosity between the two. Area 4 and Riverside should have been chosen -- their problems are much more similar.<sup>14</sup>

---

12. Appendix I, op cit.

13. Application, op cit., p. 10.

14. Barbara Markunas, Interview, February, 1969.

There are strong differences between the two. Area 3 has more ethnic identity, largely Italian and Portuguese, and as part of East Cambridge has been the traditional constituency of Al Vellucci, a colorful city councillor and long-time baiter of Harvard and "the professionals." Its social patterns are compatible with its ethnic identification, the church and the extended family playing an important part. Roosevelt Towers, planted in the middle of an area settled by would-be homeowners, is a target of hostility and resentment, even though many residents have relatives in the project (including Councillor Vellucci). Area 4 stands in contrast to Area 3 by the heavy presence of social services administered to the area, two settlement houses within four blocks of each other, a lively neighborhood OEO office (Area 3 has one, but it plays nowhere near the role in community affairs that 4's does), and the proximity of the city's social service centers within walking distance. Whereas Area 3 has turned to its network of ethnic relationships for both social and political support, Area 4 has made use of the city and professional services. This has in some way made them more receptive to organizing along the lines of the Model Cities Program. There is also a black population in Area 4 which has been there for a considerable time, in no sense conceiving of itself as a ghetto, and is included in the sector as identified by the presence of the settlement houses. There is a segment of homeowners in the general area of a church, referred to as the people of St. Mary's Parish. They draw a distinction between themselves and the more vocal group referred to by their connection with the settlement houses and CEOC, the local poverty agency.

Many persons have commented on the Byzantine nature of Cambridge politics; how assiduous are the attempts not to "rock the boat," though this usually involves the most circuitous, if not devious, political maneuvering.

As one observer, a social worker, said:

I have never seen such a complicated political scene. Everyone is constantly trying to figure out what everyone else is doing or might do. I just came from a small Missouri town and though this is a city of 100,000, its political way of life is similar in many ways to the patterns of the small town. It is still run on a "who-you-know" basis -- so-and-so's brother went to high school with the mayor, so he feels free to drop in to City Hall for a chat and does so.<sup>15</sup>

Such a system or style may mitigate against the formation of organizations as a means for solving political problems, and in avoiding confrontation tend to keep things as they are -- making adjustments for the fortunate individual, but not altering the basic structure which produced the problem.

As a subject, Cambridge Model Cities has much to recommend it beyond its accessibility to me as a student-resident. It represents a type of low income "neighborhood" which will be increasingly prevalent, the area defined not by its inhabitants, but by the application of federal guidelines. Arbitrary as it is, it frees the researcher from the usually difficult task of drawing the boundary of a neighborhood, skirting for him the issue of which indicator should be used: geographic, political, some measure of socio-economic status, or a combination of them all. Such determinations seldom, if ever, receive universal recognition from the inhabitants, as does the Model Cities area, so designated by fiat.

---

15. Frank McGuire, in conversation, November, 1968.

In the future, the discussion about citizen participation will be directed towards just such areas, and as such will become the focus of increasing attention and need for study.

## II. A TYPOLOGY FOR PARTICIPATION

An early question in the study was to try and determine how much interest in and rate of participation can be ascribed to personality and how much was due to structure of the organization which calls for participation. Implicit in the voluntary act of participation are personality factors, factors which are the cause of, or explain, individual motivation. When a choice to participate or not participate is made, it is intimately bound up with one's image of self and sense of efficacy, the immediate relationship one has to family, friends, and whether these ties provide constructions on the individual or widen his possible activities, and to what degree. But it is also influenced by the objective behavior of the organization which elicits participation: its command of power and/or resources, its goals and rationale, and how it conveys this to and is perceived by the public -- which again brings us back to the personality structure in reference to the individual.

It would be useful to establish how these factors interact with one another, and to what extent they are independent. It is a hypothesis of this paper that one's behavior, rate of participation, and quality of participation are dependent upon the primacy of the motive. As motivation changes, so does behavior. This does not assume that one factor always has primacy, or that we can at this stage measure that with certainty. Mixture is assumed; the fruitful discussion would seem to establish how those different relationships are reflected in, and thus possibly predict, participation. If, through the development of a simple

typology of motivation, certain types can be established that follow predictable behavior patterns, and causes can be in some way suggested, then we will have a better basis both for the rationale of participation, and the pragmatic realization of effective participation. Utilizing this knowledge, an organization should better be able to measure its own need and capacity to use participation effectively, and to anticipate the type of response it will engender.

Two basic motivations were seen as representing the above mentioned factors, and from them a typology expressing a range of combinations was developed. The basic motivations were labeled simply "internal" and "external." As these two descriptive states of motivation show themselves, develop and change in individuals, we will try to see if patterns of behavior are related in a way manageable for analysis.

By "internal" motivation, I mean those motivations which are concerned with personality needs and responses which can be met or engendered by participation in public problem-solving groups: the desire to meet and see people, to be seen, to escape family problems, or "learn what's going on" in order to satisfy curiosity. In short, it covers those motivations which express the need for escape, personal affirmation, or recreation.

The "external" motivation is not one of psychic need in the immediate sense, but is a response to a recognized problem whose solution may be achieved through the process of participation. Participation, as seen by the person so motivated, is a means to an end, not an end in itself, as



it could be for the internally motivated individual. The motivation is the resolution of a specific problem or set of problems, which in some way have a public nature, so that joint action is felt to be necessary.

A. Pure Types

As one would expect, in dealing with types of people expressing these motivations, one would be hard put to find either pure type. But in order to establish limits, let me set out the boundary markers. The pure "internal" would not care about program outcome as long as the group maintained itself undisturbed by outside influences. (Internal changes brought about by his own action would usually be welcome, though we all are apt to overlook the unintended effect.) He is concerned with the process contained in the maintenance of an organization. Thus, he is analogous to the bureaucrat whose reward/goal (income/security) is often not closely related to the goals posited by the organization as a whole.<sup>1</sup> As we shall see, this type rarely exists for any meaningful period of time, once engaged in participation, for the condition is not stable, and the personality involved quickly looks for motives to rationalize his position. However, an example was afforded by a respondent quoted in Gans's Levittowners, which indicates the disposition of

---

1. Anthony Downs, *Inside Bureaucracy*; Boston, Little Brown & Co., 1967; Michel Crozier, op. cit.

this type.<sup>2</sup>

The pure "external": non-existent internal motivation, with high external motivation drawing him to participation, could exist, recalling that the definition of external motivation, as a category is in reference to a particular kind of public, political, participation. It would mean that the participant found no rewards in the process; it was, for instance, time consuming, boring, or frustrating, but the expected goal was worth the cost. With the "external" there is always goal orientation and in this sense the person so motivated is more future oriented than his ideal polar type ("internal"), for the particular situation. Thus, the ideal "internally motivated" person in regard to program and goals would be present oriented, for his purpose in participation is, let us say, recreation, the immediate gain from the immediate process. In this case, there is a congruence between "private regarding" and present time-oriented, as described in City Politics, by Banfield and Wilson,<sup>3</sup> but it is not necessarily constant. Participation in one group may be, for the political animal, recreation ("internal"), in another it may be a question of

---

2. "Some people were motivated by strong personal needs for being leaders... 'I wanted to be active when I first came here; I have a need for it in spurts and this was the year I needed it. I had been cooped up with three children for a whole year before and had a desperate need to be active. The Sisterhood happened to be the first thing I was asked to be active in and so I became active in it. Now I'm a little sorry because I want to organize a nursery school more, but I have an obligation to the Sisterhood.'" -- Herbert Gans, The Levittowners, New York, Pantheon Books, 1967, p. 139.

3. Edward C. Banfield and James Q. Wilson, City Politics, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1965, Chapter XVI.

survival (external motivation). Moreover, "external motivation" does not necessarily imply "public regarding," the goals aimed at conceivably being highly personal.

In order to act, being so motivated, the situation generating the motivation would need to be fairly immediate and intense, or the expectation of success high, or both. In the Cambridge Model Cities Program, neither situation is met fully. The efficacy of the Model Cities Program is still unknown, it being in the organizational, planning stages of operation, and though it starts with far less suspicion than most government initiated programs, and carries an initial good will, the people in general have adopted a wait-and-see attitude. The only threat or crisis of the order to call out such participation is the "Inner Belt," a belt route through Cambridge which would displace an estimated 2,000 families. This, however, predates the Model Cities by some years and as such has brought into being, by its threat, organizations to fight it. They have not yet been superseded in this role by the Model Cities Agency.

Both internal and external motivation are labels which help to order certain complimentary and competing aspects of personality under a rubric which, depending upon the degree of intensity of the various determinants, leads to the presence or absence of those motivations so categorized. Both groupings, that of external motivation and internal motivation, are dependent upon the arrangement of several competing factors of motivation. A central factor in the behavior of an individual regarding voluntary

participation is his sense of personal efficacy and power and the degree to which he is able to see this expressed in political terms. Can the political process be a mechanism for expression of himself as an operative individual? Studies have shown<sup>4</sup> that the lower class has lower rates of participation than do the middle and upper classes in all types of organizations, but particularly in those which are designated as "civic" in nature. Explanations of this are rife; two poles of the argument are: (a.) that intrinsic within the "life style" of the lower class is a disinclination to join organizations, both because the process is distasteful, and because "civic" concerns are not their concerns, and therefore under no circumstances short of a crisis would they organize; or, (b.) their lack of participation is due in fact to a realistic appraisal of the political mechanism's ability to meet their needs, and that in fact anyone faced with their objective situation irrespective of class would, in a short time, respond in the same way: with minimal participation based on little anticipation of success.

The issue seems to hinge on two questions: the power with which any group enters a political situation, and the relative urgency of the issue for each group concerned. But often the issue is seen from the position of class and value system. In a study of citizen participation in urban renewal, Professor James Q. Wilson sees a distinction between the lower

---

4. Julian L. Woodward and Elmo Roper, "Political Activity of American Citizens," in Robert Lane, Political Life, New York, Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, p. 221.

and the middle classes which he designates as "private regarding" and "public regarding," respectively.

The view which a neighborhood is likely to take of urban renewal then is in great part a product of its class composition. Upper and upper-middle-class people are more likely to think in terms of general plans, the neighborhood or community as a whole, and long-term benefits (even when they might involve immediate costs to themselves); lower and lower-middle-class people are more likely to see such matters in terms of specific threats and short-term costs.<sup>5</sup>

From the specific of the urban renewal experience, Wilson generalizes willingness and ability which low income neighborhoods have in general to organize.

The important thing is not that they are unorganizable, but that they can be organized only under special circumstances and for special purposes ... Lower-income neighborhoods are more likely to produce collective action in response to threats (real or imagined) than to create opportunities. Because of the "private" regarding nature of their attachment to the community, they are likely to collaborate when each person can see a danger to him or to his family in some proposed change; collective action is a way, not of defining and implementing some broad program for the benefit of all but of giving force to individual objections by adding them together in a collective protest ...<sup>6</sup>

Wilson argues that private regarding people, basically low income people, have little sense of community and that they are basically reactive, unwilling to make constructive plans for the neighborhood, that they are hypersensitive to threats, but not essentially creative. Although not

---

5. James Q. Wilson, "Planning and Politics: Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal," in James Q. Wilson, Urban Renewal: The Record and the Controversy, Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1967, p. 414.

6. Ibid., p. 414.

intended by the author, many may find implicit in this description of behavior a value judgment juxtaposing one class's attitudes against another. It is assumed that the objective situation is the same for both classes and that the reactions of the lower class are indicative of pathology: reacting to imagined threats, being hypersensitive. The middle class, on the other hand, is seen as thinking in terms of the general good and long term benefits -- "even when they might involve costs to themselves."<sup>7</sup> In such a contrast, the lower class appears selfish and small-minded; their actions do not rise above "giving force to individual objections."

Drawing from the experience of urban renewal, which does call forth such reactions, Wilson uses this as a model for participation for the lower class in general, explaining much of this by inclination as well as necessity, on their part. But what of the necessity for such behavior? Is it unique to the lower class, intrinsic in their life style, or even the external qualities of their life? What are the causes that led to their behavior in the type of case, urban renewal, which Wilson was using as his data? First examine the question of power which each group is bringing to the issue.

As Wilson and others point out, the lack of education, administrative skills and experience, as well as the time and energy, are factors which

---

7. Ibid., p. 409.

limit the power of the poor in dealing with existing political structures. This is a real problem; one which cannot be dismissed. But even when presented by those who have seemed to grasp these aspects of the problems of the poor, there is the tendency to explain the problem in terms which see the lower class personality causing the situation: the poor are inherently less capable.

Low-income people are overwhelmed by concrete daily needs. Their lives are often crisis-ridden, deflecting from any concern with community issues. They have no belief in their ability to affect the world in which they live, and so they are not easily induced to try affect it. Frequently they lack the necessary resources of knowledge and information to enable them to scrutinize social policies. Leadership capabilities are also scarce among the poor. Moreover, when leaders do emerge, the poor have few incentives to offer them and means of controlling them are scarce. Potential leaders therefore tend to take advantage of opportunities for their own advancement that move them quickly away from low income concerns. Finally, the institutions whose services might offer incentives for low-income interest and activity are often effectively insulated from the low income community by their structure, practices, and cultural style.<sup>8</sup>

After having stated that the poor do not participate for a variety of valid reasons, she then states that, moreover, they don't have much leadership capability. If, in his judgment, there is little reason to participate in community affairs, a leader will find other activities to express his leadership capabilities. We now have enough examples (Malcolm X's autobiography, for instance) to show that many "leaders" channel their capability into other areas<sup>9</sup> than what the middle-class calls "community

---

8. Frances Piven, "Participation of Residents in Neighborhood Community Action Programs," in Hans Spiegel, Citizen Participation in Urban Development, p. 118.

(Emphasis added.)

9. Areas (as James Q. Wilson pointed out to me in reference to Elliott Liebow's Tally's Corner) of immediate satisfaction. But as Liebow makes clear, the decision can be seen as an economically rational assessment of comparative rates of return between present and future related activity,

affairs." This does not mean that leadership capability is lacking; it does mean that opportunities for leadership of the type she looks for is lacking.

To understand this it must be clear that our structures do not allow equal access and equal choice among all classes. According to Dale Rodgers Marshall, who has made a bibliographic review of the literature:

The evidence of participation and organization is also a cause for concern for those who think democracy entails equal access to power since the evidence shows that while the amount of participation may not vary by life style it does vary by S.E.S. (socio-economic-status).<sup>10</sup>

The power which poor people bring to the table in planning for the community in such an example as urban renewal, in terms of the ability to make others do what they normally would not do,<sup>11</sup> is clearly not equal to that of their better-heeled compatriots who are bargaining for "a better community." Moreover, due to the power differential, the discussions are often not truly open; many decisions having already been decided. For instance, the poor residents in Cambridge had little to do in planning the location of belt route, until it was routed down their streets. At that point there was little action left to them short of being "obstructionist." They weren't included in the decision when earlier M.I.T. vetoed the routing through their land (a decision made by persons most would regard as "public regarding").

---

10. Dale Rodgers Marshall, "Who Participates in What," Urban Affairs Quarterly, December, 1968, p. 213.

11. Robert Dahl, Modern Political Analysis, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, 1963.



As Wilson points out, much of the planning is done to them; the options are closed long before they are given the chance to be anything but obstructionist. When bargaining is undertaken by groups of two different economic classes, it might be said that the probability of an issue being discussed which will redistribute directly the resources of the richer to the poorer people (such as losing his house for the benefit of the poor person, a not uncommon experience for the poor person in urban renewal's attempt to make a better community), decreases directly as the sum redistributed increases.

A basic problem of the poor, I would say the basic problem, is economic. They have less money than the rest of society. To the extent that money is power, or can gain those instruments of power such as education, to say the poor have less money is to say they have less power, power in political terms. In this country while the problems of the individual are broadly assumed to be satisfied through the political process, in fact, the basic economic questions of distribution, as opposed to production, have largely been left unanswered. The poor, while recognizing their plight, do not see the political process as a mechanism for solving it. For this reason, it is a plight and not a problem for it does not allow of solution by means of the mechanisms provided by society. Thus, as Lane's Political Life points out, the lower class may make little explicit connection between economic problems and political solutions.<sup>12</sup>

---

12. Robert Lane, op cit, pp. 103, 104, 332.

Apart from the consideration of the power differential, when discussing the relative proclivity to participate on the part of the lower and middle classes, one must also consider the relative urgency, the stakes which each have in the outcome of the issue. Implied was an equality of gain or loss in Wilson's comparison of behavior between public and private regarding people. Do they, in fact, incur equal benefits and equal costs in a typical political decision involving both classes? I think it is clear the answer is no. The public regarding group will not materially suffer loss proportionate to that suffered by those designated "private regarding." In a very real sense they cannot afford to be public regarding -- that is to think of the welfare of others most probably better off than they are, when it threatens their basic needs. And who can be public regarding in these circumstances? When one speaks of public regarding, and of "long-term" benefits, one must ask which public and who benefits? If the economic situation of the middle class were to be changed drastically so that their survival in terms of housing, health, employment, education, and power distribution were the same as that which faces the lower-income group today, it seems fair to assume that there would be a reorientation of priorities in which the "middle class" (judged by education, consumer preference, and other such indices with which the middle class distinguishes itself from the lower) would become "private regarding" and crisis-oriented with little future orientation. Private regarding, because we all share the instinct for self-preservation, and crisis-oriented, because planning and future orientation demands some assurance of stability, and a sense that the political process is funda-

mentally sympathetic and responsive to the substantive thrust of such planning. In this country, at this time, the poor cannot share such hopes. (Whatever the objective state, in few countries today does the majority of the population feel, as it does in this one, that the enemy of progress and general happiness is "the poor." In most countries, the enemy is "the rich." What is disheartening about this contrast is that in too many cases, the poor here are apt to believe this.)

Placed in the context of unequal power and unequal costs, the designations "private regarding" and "public regarding" do little to explain behavior and are, in fact, misleading by overlooking the inequalities in the relationship. A moral niggardliness is affixed to a class supposing, other things being equal, something not justified. If descriptive terms are needed that go some way to explain behavior, then the contrast drawn by "survival oriented" and "amenity oriented" may better fit the behavior pattern illustrated by Wilson's study.<sup>13</sup> But this corresponds best when a crisis is involved and does not explain participation of the lower class in non-crisis orientation, a problem of variety and, with the passage of time, importance.

---

13. It commits the same error of simplification which Wilson's dichotomy does, by not recognizing the diversity of types within a poor neighborhood. What is the definition of "poor" in such a neighborhood -- economic, "cultural," or some combination thereof? The justification for not delineating this is twofold: philosophically, to counter Wilson's position that persons in poor neighborhoods do not organize except under crisis, due to their value system and secondly, more pragmatically, one aim of this study is to document and explain the participation that does take place in one such poor neighborhood. This is in response to the existing political system. Federal guidelines have been established which set physical boundaries for "poverty" neighborhoods, based essentially on economic data. This being the basis for activity, it mitigates the necessity to define which "poor" participates.

It is a hypothesis of this paper that the participation, or lack of it, in non-crisis-oriented organizations can best be explained functionally: The decision to participate is dependent upon how much power the organization has and whether the individual concerned perceives it as using that power in his interest.

Whether one sees the political process, then, as an attractive expression of personal power may not be a question of intrinsic reactions predicated upon one set of values. It may be dependent upon the degree to which the process is seen as effective for the individual -- "will it deliver the goods?" -- the basic test of any political process.

In a society where proving one's own independence is considered to be a value in itself, retreatism is the most satisfactory mode of adjustment as long as the proposed participation does not adequately insure full rights of control.<sup>14</sup>

In the actual classification of those interviewed, I used a criterion, admittedly subjective, of the individual's overall susceptibility to act by "external" or "internal" motivation, judged by his behavior in general, as ascertained through the interview and observation (meetings, public records, others interviewed, etc.). This allows for distinctions between those who would normally participate, but are affected by a particular barrier, and those who normally do not participate, yet do recognize specific and immediate problems.

---

14. Crozier, op cit, p. 206.

B. Category Types

1. "The True Participant" -- High internal motivation,  
High external motivation (Hi, Hx)

This group generally is the most dependable in terms of estimating participation. As a rule, they had a longer history of participation than other groups, representing the fruits of a self-selecting process which does not favor indifference or indecision.

Internal motivation: Mike a barber, artist in charcoals and oils, self-taught, musician, sometime bandleader, and politician, and member of the CDA board is an extremely affable person, who likes to talk and discuss. He is decidedly unideological, perfectly willing to have an opposing view put forward, engagin in conversation for itself more than establishing a substantive point of view. He gets personal satisfaction from the social aspects of participation. Often at CDA board meetings, he pays little attention to the debate, but will sometimes interrupt to make a joke or ask if what they are doing is legal, and when assured that it is, will smile and with a wave of the hand tell them to continue, that he's all for it. This may be due to the fact that he, more than most resident members feels he represents a constituency, the landlords, and that until matters pertinent to them come up, he is perfectly willing to let others discuss structure and procedure, which has been the body of work up to now. He is not bothered by the sometimes interminable discussion, but seems to find it all good fun. His history in things political goes back some time, ("I campaigned for Curley"), and he himself ran for city council in Cambridge and state representative (1937), losing both. He is past president of the

American Master Barbers' Association, Chapter 854, and of the Fraternal Order of Eagles as well. His reason for getting involved in politics generally was enjoyment of process, stated no more analytically than, "I like it." He had the necessary predisposition to the process of participation, which promoted his interest when an external motivation for participation presented itself.

The persons in this group expressed an enjoyment in the process, even in some cases an explicit need. "I have to be involved, I can't sit still. With me it's personality." The need for a sense of motion, of activity, voiced by Lorraine W., is apparant in all of those interviewed in this group.

Another generalized view reflecting personal outlook and behavior was expressed by Janet: "I like helping people. People have been very nice to me." Janet, who is a mother of five, has come a long way in her political development since she first became involved, eight years ago. She was the first person to be transferred from public housing to leased housing (private market housing whose rent is subsidized by the housing authority). This would not have been accomplished without the strong political ties she has developed, as it was accomplished after a well-organized sit-in and three-day demonstration followed by letters to New York and Washington.

Motion or release figures, too, in her participation. She is separated from her husband and, with five kids, she has told me of her need for the

distraction such activity allows: "I'd go crazy if I had to be around the house all day." Janet, also a CDA board member, became involved with public affairs not with the expectation of enjoyment, so much as a sense of duty. Reflecting on her situation, she commented:

I like being involved. When you first start you're not so interested. You see how bad everything is and you've got to do something. It's a fever that grows on you -- like that kid who just called on the telephone who's about to be evicted, and needs a place to go. She has five kids and I have five kids. I've got to help her.

You wouldn't believe it, eight years ago I was afraid to go to City Hall, shaking. Less than eight years ago, I was completely uninvolved. I started by joining a stupid nursery group. My daughter was going to nursery school, and I joined the committee. I felt I should be involved because my kids were involved. They (nursery group) were going to the School Committee meeting next week, to protest a statement that one of the men had made that Head Start was only baby-sitting.

A general sense of duty or responsibility, with an implicit sense of guilt, if not taken up, is more clearly related to internal personality needs than it is to action taken in response to a specifically recognized problem, such as the poor teaching in the nursery school. Duty, in Janet's case, provided the original impetus, but today, eight years later, enjoyment is coupled with whatever residual duty remains, as a major motivational factor. Today, she is president of the neighborhood planning team, and on the board of directors of several neighborhood organizations, as well as the local poverty agency. She is an extremely effective politician, and she relishes it. Duty alone would not, in all probability, sustain her level of intensity.

Coupled with her sense of duty is a personality which encourages her to implement it. Her sense of efficacy can find expression in political terms. She has a basic "fighter" outlook, as the episode of her housing transfer testifies. She will not admit defeat easily:

My mother worked for a politician. I lived in the South End. I think that's the reason why I'm involved. Things there are bad and you are always fighting for something. I was a kid but I learned then that you have to speak for something you wanted. If you live in an area like this and have kids I don't see how you could help but get involved. It's good too because it rubs off on the kids.

Duty, too, plays a part in Mrs. Fahy's participation; but her Irish exuberance and obvious delight in people and their curious doings belie any heavy-handed moral obligation:

I first got involved in the neighborhood when one day I showed up at the Neighborhood House and the teacher for the nursery school didn't come that day, so I took over and was there for two years. I've been active all my life. I taught Sunday school when I was ten, girl scouts until I was eighteen, did volunteer service in the North End. I like to be nice to people; I want to help people worse off than me. Maybe I got it from my father. He was on the School Committee and worked with the summer camp.

Not everyone shows this sense of good citizenship, but in this group she is not alone, nor is she alone in ascribing it in part, at least, to family, for Lorraine has something similar to say about her youth and family:

When I was a kid, I was a volunteer for eight years at the Community Center. I stopped when I got married, then got active again at Roosevelt Towers. An organizer from PBH (at Harvard) got me to write a newspaper and then I became the head of a summer day camp for kids. My father was always in things. He belonged to the men's club in church. I was in the girl scouts for twelve years -- always into something.



Barbara M. has run for school committee, and is on the Wellington-Harrington Citizens' Committee. "I have been in many of the city councillors' homes and they in mine." She classifies herself as one who enjoys a good (political) fight and enjoys the process of working towards a goal such as better health care, as contrasted with her husband, who is "not involved primarily because basically he is not a joiner."

That she may see herself as a joiner tells us little normally, unless we can determine why she is a joiner. Like others, she receives obvious enjoyment from the process of being political, of meeting and dealing with other people, trying to gauge their behavior, so as best to achieve one's own aims; the game of politics as well as the role of politics. She has certain wide range interests, but not a specific issue or group. Hers is more the attitude attributed to the middle-class, that of a sense of community welfare, and indeed she is middle-class, as will be seen.

All of those in this group had been previously involved and thus one can assume continued involvement was predicated on an assumption of continued personal satisfaction. Not one of the people interviewed in the group reacted in a negative way to the processes of participation; all expressed a need for personal involvement of this type. Duty played an important part, traceable perhaps to their families. Duty, when expressed in terms of activity extending beyond the family, is regarded as an attribute more common in the middle class.<sup>15</sup> And such values as expressed here, found in lower class areas, have been attributed to downwardly mobile persons, that

---

15. David Riesman, "Faces in the Crowd," Individual Studies in Character and Politics, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1964, p. 34.

is, persons of middle-class origins. With the exception of Barbara M., whose husband has worked up to a managerial position from telephone repairman, and now has a summer home in New Hampshire, all are lower-income persons. None has been to college. Their parents' class is unknown to me, and thus I cannot speak on the question of mobility patterns. However, Janet's case does suggest an expanding sense of duty from family to community; the sense of duty itself is not the indicator of values, but its goal orientation.

External motivation: External motivation was high for this group (Hx). Lorraine had a definite purpose in running for the CDA board and one which guides her in her actions:

Another reason why I'm so active is I'm not satisfied with the black population in this area being represented in all stages of programs. I took it upon myself to make sure black persons are on all programs.

She has a constituency whose goals she identifies with and from whom she can gain a sense of values which defines her direction. Her behavior on the CDA is often different from the others, and she herself has stated to me that her voting cannot be predicted in terms of one or another of the groups represented on the board. Hers is a unique constituency, one cutting across those implicit or explicit ones which guide other members, i.e., business interests, land owners, renters, or public housing people. Yet, because she is confident of the validity of her representation, her interpretation of her constituency's needs, she is secure in maintaining an independent position despite it being subject to pressures from other groups. Mike, the artist/barber, also illustrates the assurance born of

having a recognized constituency. His behavior of careless buffoonery can be explained both in terms of his highly gregarious personality, and his external motivation: "I was president of the landlords' association, (he founded it last year), that's why I ran: to see what they (CDA) were going to do. The landlords suggested it -- a lot of them don't speak English too good, so I'd be the one to tell them what's going on."

His inattention so far can thus be explained by close attention to a specific goal-oriented issue or set of issues: those impinging on the landlords, with little concern for the general "welfare of the community."

Janet has been involved in neighborhood planning for some years, growing out of her initial sense of responsibility to her child.

We had been trying to figure out with COBI (Conference of Organizations, Blocks, and Individuals) how to get money. We knew that things couldn't keep on going the way they had been. M.I.T. would be buying it. The universities and business would move the people out.

Maintenance and restoration of the neighborhood against the inroads of the institutions, and of aging were the external goals which motivated Janet. As a highly successful amateur politician, speaking as a resident with competing groups, Janet has found it necessary to define her limits and responsibility of power. Janet can separate herself from her Area Four constituency (as president of that area's planning board) only at the risk of losing her base, something which she, as a skilled politician, would not be quick to do. Moreover, she recognizes now as she did when the structure was being established, the value of a specific constituency to anyone who makes decisions directly affecting others. She argued long for some

kind of district representation, but was defeated on this issue, the only one, as she pointed out. Some of her external motivation is diffused by the politician's first need to maintain a position of influence. In order to achieve her external goals she represents a constituency whose goals may not always coincide with her own, but this in itself provides rewards (pleasure of public recognition, etc.) and this may temper the immediacy of any personal external demands, a typical political problem. But it is also, in its willingness to compromise, an indication of a willingness to plan and think of future goals, future battles.

Mrs. Fahy, in whom resides that Yankee sense of obligation about public concerns which Hofstadter contrasts with the personal ethic of the Southern and Middle Europeans,<sup>16</sup> has also found within the structure an area, education, which meets the more generalized internal need. Hers is a clear example of one motivation reinforcing the other.

You participate first of all because it's something that you want to get out of it, like fighting for better education -- I sort of drifted into that -- you've got to like it. Old Yankee good-citizenship. It's personality. Because I'm a Scorpio (good chuckle).

Barbara M. also saw the Model Cities Program as one which could realize other previously recognized goals:

At the last general meeting of the four, Justin asked for volunteers for the steering committee to draw up the constitution. I volunteered. Why? I thought it was a good thing -- a chance to put some money, some teeth into the things people had

---

16. Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform: From Byron to F.D.R., New York, Vintage Books, 1955, p. 8-9.

talked about for the city for years. I thought, why back out now? I had been in it from the beginning.

Later, she was to back out, for reasons which will be explained.

How do members of this group express their sense of personal efficacy in political terms. It follows both from their personalities as extroverts and their commitment to realizing specific goals, that the respondents in this group exhibited the optimistic belief that individuals can change the external situation through political participation. Lorraine, whose basic goal was an increased awareness and support of the blacks in Cambridge, when asked whether she felt she was effective, answered positively:

The blacks now have a little more faith in the program. They know I'm on the board, and the way I feel. Reverend Graham (a black minister) is on it too, but he's been in his bag, but I've been talking to him and now he sees things that he didn't see before.

She pointed to specific cases which gave her a sense of accomplishment. One was in questioning the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority about a board which was to be set up to select applicants for a low to moderate income housing project, giving them notice that they would have to be careful to be able to show that no discrimination existed against Negroes, and that she would kill the whole thing if it seemed that way. I attended the meeting, so Lorraine did not recount to me the proceedings again, but indeed she served effective notice of her concerns. Essentially, this is a limited demand, forcing an agency to do "what it should do." The second matter was the inclusion of black history in the proposal section on education which, she said "they had left out -- nobody thought about it until I mentioned it." Also, she feels that she is serving indirectly as a channel between members

of the black community and officials. She cited an example in which she introduced the capable friend to someone in the office of community development, who was later hired by that office.

She feels that her goals are reasonable; both that they are ones which normatively make sense, and pragmatically can be achieved through the process of participation politics, specifically the Model Cities Program.

Another respondent, Mike, does limit the context of the individual's effectiveness: "If they (the government) want the Belt Route, they'll put it in." But he too showed a basic optimism, almost a boosterism justifying this type of participation: "There're lots of things that if you want you can get. You've got to fight for it -- have rallies, meetings,..."

Both Janet's and Mrs. Fahy's sense of duty was translated into activity of a political nature. A sense of duty without the corresponding belief in the personal act could conceivably co-exist, a painful position, one would surmise. Happily for these two, both exist together.

Not only did this group have a positive sense of their own efficacy and power, they felt politics was an effective expression as an extension of their power -- a mechanism which both acted as a medium and a method. In order for it to be an attractive method, they had to find an adequate structure (or to believe that they could change it to better meet their needs). They did not accept the dictum, "You can't fight City Hall," or, they felt that there was no need to fight City Hall, that there was a common community of interests. The specific organization with which they were dealing, the Model Cities Program, was untested. It had no political

debts and no constraints due to past behavior. Because Model Cities did not have a visible ideology, because it did not have a history, it was remarkably free of old suspicions or antagonisms. It started with a honeymoon. Generally, these people had shown a previous willingness to work with organizations. As the election indicates,<sup>17</sup> a large number of people, relatively, were willing to undergo a "suspension of disbelief," and give it at least qualified support until this would be proved a mistake. Having no past record, for good or bad, its success in achieving participation was singularly dependent upon the structure it established and the way in which the residents perceived the people directly involved,- specifically, those they identify as the pros, an identification felt by the pros to be a trifle paranoiac, but which seems justified from the resident's point of view. Few people analyze the abstract plan of the structure as much as do those persons who manipulate that structure. Few of us pay attention to the formal organization chart. For them a pro is any person who claims to be working in their behalf and who gets paid for doing it, unless previous to this employment he was a resident. Then he is to be viewed with mingled suspicion and approval: approval that he has somehow gotten on the gravy train of the system, suspicion because now his allegiance cannot be assumed.

The view ascribed by the great majority of those interviewed irrespective of group, was not one that agrees with the professional's view of his

---

17. Cambridge had the highest (33%) voter turnout of any city participating in the program according to S. Arnstein and Donald Fox, Development, Dynamics and Dilemmas, unpublished manuscript.

activity as a calling which, more than being a livelihood, provides a service to others, for their benefit. From the viewpoint of the professional, there is much altruism involved in doing what he does. But the resident who only has his experience to judge from, and is not exposed to those explications of the profession as a body, (AMA, American Institute of Planners, the American Bar Association, et al.), misses this aspect (altruism) in the relationship of the professional with his client. The innate suspicion which the resident has for the professional is based partly on fear, and rightly so, given the nature and success of their involvement with "the poor over a 75-year period," but partly stems from the basic American tenet of equality, which does not readily promote the success of an elite such as technicians, when their power does not derive from the sanction of economic success.

As De Tocqueville stated:

As to the influence which the intellect of one man may have on that of another, it must necessarily be very limited in a country where the citizens placed on an equal footing are all closely seen by each other; and where, as no signs of incontestable greatness or superiority are perceived in any one of them, they are constantly brought back to their own reason as the most obvious and proximate source of truth.<sup>18</sup>

At best the relationship is one of accomodation warily maintained; at worst, it is forthright mistrust and dislike. As Janet Rose says:

The pros are smart. I know that they are not thinking about the neighborhood, they have a lot of other plans, but the residents have more common sense.

---

18. De Tocqueville, op cit., p. 144.



Resident control -- that was the only thing that would keep it from being urban renewal. If they're going to give you money you have to control it. At the neighborhood meeting we tried to decide how to control it. We wrote a list of things and took it to a lawyer in Boston. A lawyer in Boston is safer than any lawyer in Cambridge. We only made one small goof out of that. Otherwise it was legal and tight ... At the meeting we divided into pros and non-pros. One side wore white buttons, the other blue. We didn't want the pros to sit with the residents because they could influence the residents too easily. I still think that residents control. Oh, yes, I'm sure of it -- we have veto power. I'm not naive -- not to recognize that they (the professionals) can shape the program, but it would be a real stink.

Throughout Janet's talk is the theme that the pros have goals which serve themselves, not the residents. The lawyer in Cambridge is not to be trusted because he serves as ultimate client his colleagues of a different class, whose power could be disturbed by the Model Cities ordinance to a degree far surpassing a Boston attorney.

Merely from an organizational standpoint, the residents have reason to doubt their own power for one measure of power is "the ability of an individual or an organization to impose extrapolations or projections of their inner structure upon their environment."<sup>19</sup> The residents at this point are not a homogeneous group. Their specificity of goals and version of an inner structure is weak, and they may represent many conflicting constituencies. They can be easily divided. The professionals, however, are more apt to be quite clear as to who they represent and the way in which they stand in relationship to one another. This, in itself, is a form of power.

---

19. Karl Deutsch, "The Nerves of Government," Models of Political Communication and Control, New York, Free Press of Glencoe, 1963, p. 111.

There is a fear of the professionals, fear of their manipulatory ability, which will reduce the indignation with calm words and reasonable arguments. For within their framework the professionals are reasonable. They are not malicious. But this framework does not allow remedies which change the basic situation of the poor: less money, poor health, poor housing, poor education. Given the premises of the present system, what the professional does is reasonable. The residents have been socialized to accept certain premises: private enterprise, the individual success ethic, the equation of character with income, but they also rebel against their real conditions, know it to be unjust, and therefore fear the mental emasculation by which the professional will adjust them to their lot.

If one accepts participation, one is bound to cooperate, i.e., to bear one's co-participant's pressure whether they are one's equals or one's superiors. People therefore rarely agree to participate without some substantial counterpart. They try to negotiate about their participation, and give it only if they feel that they will be adequately rewarded ... Retreatism can be a very rational form of behavior whenever the individual concerned has good reason to believe that the rewards he is offered are not commensurate with his efforts, and feels that there is a good chance that he will be manipulated.<sup>20</sup>

The resident has little leverage, little counterpart, in dealing with the professional, aside from personal antagonism, which he realizes is not, in the final, enough.

---

20. Michel Crozier, op cit., p. 205.

Lorraine did not specifically mention professionals as a group in her interview, a possible indication that she saw them as less threatening to her immediate goals than do many of the other residents. This can be explained in several ways. She has a set of definite goals which makes a concrete strategy more easily defined, as opposed to the resident who wants a higher income, more interesting job, and better housing, when his skills are low, his education is minimal and the housing market is "tight." This makes the professional's response more predictable, and more favorable. The framework is limited, and the judges in the game are apt to favor her. Now, it is wise politics to make some show of tolerance towards the blacks, especially when the demands are couched with such moderation, as is the norm in Cambridge, (where even blacks are named Cabot and Lodge). Thus, she enters into a political situation with a limited demand and a reasonable expectation of success. She can explain the hows of her demands if pressed by the professionals, i.e., put another black on the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority,- unlike the resident who wants more money or better housing. What does he say?

Mike, barber and landlord, does not speak against professionals. He, too, has a recognizable constituency, his landlords' association; but as a landlord, and as a former politician, as one who would speak out against a rent control bill, his view is not far from the one many professionals share.

Mrs. Fahy only mentions the professionals and the political structure in a passing comment directed at the residents, themselves, but it states a

problem of the resident, lack of organization in the face of organized power:

They could have resident control better if they would stop fighting among themselves, the way Cambridge works: it's a tight little bureaucracy where certain ones, the Cranes, Sullivans, run things.

Lack of agreement on the part of the residents and restricted entry into the decision-making process -- these are problems which can either be alleviated or exacerbated by professionals. But, unfortunately, because of their limited help to date, suspicion makes any contribution difficult today.

Generally, Barbara M.'s view of professionals, taken from her view as a two house family woman, is not a threatening one. She does not need to depend upon professionals for survival needs. Her husband's income provides her independence, and the needs a professional can meet are marginal. She could be classified as animosity-oriented. Her view of the professional is less vehement than those, by and large, of the lower income groups:

As much as you don't like professionals, you don't get a heck of a lot done without them. Not that they tell you what is to be done, but they tell you how to say what it is that you want done.

View of Structure: For some of the people interviewed, the structure of the program or the program itself provided sufficient reason not to participate. While members of this group of highly-motivated people shared their complaints in many instances, they had a favorable attitude towards participation, and were able to find attractions in the structure which would allow a rational justification in their own minds.

Janet:

We wanted some built-in control so it wouldn't be a West End. As soon as we heard it we thought urban renewal ... resident control -- that was the only thing that would keep it from urban renewal.

Q. When you first heard about resident control, did you think it could work?

A. Yes, I did believe that a group of residents could control ... I still think that residents control ... I think Model Cities will shake up city hall. They'll (the residents) get a playground and see that they can get it and want more. The neighborhood will shape up.

Mike:

I heard about it from the paper. It looked pretty good at first. Citizen participation is the greatest thing in the world. To organize is the only way to get something done.

and Lorraine:

I liked it because we could plan for ourselves.

Clearly the concept was attractive. The concern was not a specific program or goal, but a structure which could be used on any of a number of recognized problems in a way which gave control to those it was designed to serve. One of the basic ideas seemed that the professionals would be serving in a truly staff capacity, with policy the province of the residents.

Underlying such enthusiasm is the belief that in our society men can change their situation. Not all their neighbors share this optimism. As Mike himself admitted with a grin, when asked what the people who came into the barbershop thought of Model Cities, "You know what they think? They think it's a pile of horseshit." But this group of committed participants have a

belief in the structure, in an abstract sense, separate from the program. They were willing to make an initial act of faith because they had an already present drive to participate, to invest in the belief that structures do effect differences in programs -- a jump that those who take a wait-and-see approach, less persistently optimistic, will not make. As participants become part of the structure, particularly those taking explicit roles of responsibility, it is natural that their belief in the structure becomes more firmly wedded, particularly so in this case, as they become the embodiment of the citizen participation concept. In their interviews, little mention is made of specific programatic issues, though each does have some special province of interest. As the decision-makers for the whole area, the members of the board are forced to become aware of a range of problems. However, in the beginning, their view necessarily focuses on establishing a framework within which program possibilities can be worked out. The necessary political process of diffusion and goal substitution takes place as role shifts from the observer, free of responsibility, to that of initiator and implementer. Those in a position of responsibility become less subject to evaluating in terms of program, while those who have not participated fully or in a role which is highly visible, become more so.

This group then, the most highly involved, generally share an optimistic attitude towards their own abilities and the response of the world to their expression of those abilities. In some cases, they act from this basis, in others the necessity of the act itself, of activity for itself, seems to compel them, in order to be internally consistent, to adopt such an outlook.

A sense of duty to the larger community going beyond obligation to kin, usually a quality ascribed to the middle class,<sup>21</sup> was present for several. None of those persons expressing this view were obviously downwardly mobile; some definitely were not. Although they seemed to recognize constituencies and have areas of interest which helped their decision-making, the majority with the exception of possibly one, Mike, were not involved on a one-issue basis. They had a wider sense of community betterment. The particular nature of the Model Cities Program, which is not issue specific, of course, would act as a selecting filter to encourage this phenomenon.

A predisposition to the act of participation was prevalent, and seemed to guide them in their history of participation.

This would find particular encouragement by the form of the structure, which promised both latitude and power in the act of participation. For this group, structure is a variable upon which initial participation is at least partially dependent and whose importance does not decrease over time.

---

21. An explanation for middle class values found within the manual occupations, suggested by Richard Hamilton, "The Behavior and Values of Skilled Workers," in Blue Collar Worker, p. 44.

2. The Coffee Klatchers (Hi, Lx):  
Politics as a Club

What of those persons in the set defined by high internal motivation and low, or non-existent external motivation? Either they were repelled by the particular structure, or would reply if asked that everything was "pretty much all right with them" and that "they liked their neighborhood fine." In my interviewing, I found none who fit this description, among those who participate. One might assume this: Someone who has no quarrel with the public world around them would not be expected to join an activist group who wished to bring about change. (And if they participated in order to maintain the status quo, they would be classified as having some external motivation, and would not be in this class.) If they wish to satisfy their high internal motivation, there are many other possible outlets: social groups, ethnic clubs, bowling teams, and the like.

Yet this overlooks the very strong social role of politics, and one of the important ways persons are first introduced to political life. In urban poor areas, historically, the political and social life were inextricably bound up -- the political club was just that, a club with outings, picnics, holiday festivities, very much determined by and determining friendship patterns.<sup>22</sup> At least one person interviewed can be identified as once being in this set, and several others with probability. A person's first introduction to participation in a goal specific group may come about

---

22. For a fascinating first-hand account of the interrelationship of politics, occupation and social patterns, see Capt. Schmidtberger's testimony before the Chicago Court, New York Legislature, Senate, Police Department of New York Report and Proceedings, 1894.



with little specific interest, or knowledge, of the program goals, his appearance due to the request of, or interest generated by, a friend. This will be discussed more fully under patterns of communication and also in the analysis of those who participate.

Given this cause for participation, it follows that a not small role of participation or non-participation is contingent upon nothing more substantive than who you know, or who knows you. Personal contact may be not only sufficient, but the necessary cause for participation. Consider the interview with Connie F.:

I've never heard of the program. No, no one ever came to talk to me about it. Around December (when I told her there was the vote on the proposal) I wasn't here, I was in the hospital for a while. I don't go out much. I married when I was very young; he was one of the first men I went out with, and he's quite a bit older. My husband is very jealous. He hardly ever takes me out, and is very suspicious when I visit my girlfriends. I guess he has reason to be, because a lot of them cheat on their husbands. But I'm very busy. I work at the house in the morning and then I work at the factory from 3 to 11:15 P.M., but I was just laid off. It would be no use calling me up, as I'm always out. If they asked me, I'd organize the mothers around this neighborhood. If a man came around, like you're doing now and talked to me about it. We'd like a place for the teenagers to go like the Y. What do they (Model Cities) want? A better town?

We could use a child's playground, and a place for activities, like teen dances.

While she mentioned a specific project which she would like enacted (a teenage center), it was mentioned in a manner which did not suggest previous exploration of the problem, as much as it did a gambit for conversation. This is not to denigrate either the idea, or her sincerity,

but merely to explain why I placed her in this category of Hi, Ix. In the course of the conversation, which lasted over an hour and was quite remarkable for the full and explicit nature of her personal life and her husband's behavior towards her, it was quite clear that an outlet such as I provided, an outsider with whom she could talk, was a welcome change. If I had been a representative of an agency asking for participation, it is likely that I would have met with a favorable response (this does not imply that the quality, or even the duration, of her participation would meet the expectations of the agency). Her mild awareness of her need for some teenage facility is sufficient as an internal rationalization for participation, and would find a positive response among other participants, many who hold similar notions of what the community needs. Whether her husband would allow her to participate is not germane, for in this instance she is standing for a type who does not participate because of lack of personal communication. At this point we are examining the willingness to participate and what would elicit an internal response rather than whether her response would be realized in action.

Among this class, are, hypothetically, as was pointed out by others interviewed (and I, myself, have observed, though not in an interview situation) many of the elderly, whose overall desire for social change may be blunted by age and awareness of approaching death, but whose need for some kind of activity as distraction and for human companionship, is great. (It would be erroneous, as well as condescending, to suppose that these motivations cannot also engender effective work.) This group, because of high internal needs, would not put a premium on structure and would easily

assimilate whatever goals were stated by the body. Views of professionals and structure are secondary and only develop with active and continued commitment to the program. Even a disbelief in this type of political process as the correct mechanism for change is mitigated, for instance with the elderly, by the strength of the internal need.

### 3. The Dogged Goal Setter (Li, Hx)

This was an empty set. No one interviewed, nor encountered informally, met this description, as stated earlier in the description of such ideal types. This is not the place to go into a discussion of the place of "real" or "ideal" in the world of politics. Suffice it to say that, as is true for the above category, also an "ideal," it is not stable and soon a person so classified will modify his motivation, moving to another group. Either the person finds the process more immediately painful than the future benefits warrant, and ceases participation, or he develops actually or through rationalization (which may be the same thing) a liking or at least tolerance for the process. This changes the status to a less polarized position, such as the following.

### 4. Widening Horizons? (Mi, Hx)

Two of the people interviewed were placed in this category. Both are married, both work and are homeowners. They share a belief in work, are critical of people on government support, and have a suspicion of professionals, balanced by a pragmatic acceptance of the rules of the political game. Arthur Spiros, whose interview follows below, is a self-employed engineer. His wife works as C.O. for the Wellington-Harrington Citizens Council, Urban Renewal.

When I saw that Cambridge was going to be considered for Model Cities, I was insulted. I wanted to know why they considered this a Model City. I was interested in what they were going to do. I couldn't see why citizens should have eminent domain over my property and I felt that if I got involved I might have a part in deciding what happened. I didn't want residents deciding what would happen to my house, I've lived here for thirty years. So I volunteered for the referendum committee.

Most everyone concerned with Federal money is from the projects. I fought Justin Grey and the others but they didn't want the things I was for. Now they're putting them back in. Like I wanted real estate speculation control. There are a lot of things that can be done to control the speculator, but I don't want rent control. My gosh, when that comes up I'm going to be at every meeting. What I suggested was to organize the ordinance in terms of what opposition you want to meet. Like the agencies with veto power. They didn't want any agency representation. Can you imagine the trouble they would be having? I fought hard for the DPW: they should be on the board. I saw the agency as a way of providing a communication between the people and the government agencies. Anything should be a coalition government.

I'm the type of guy that if they tell me what I got to do, I rebel. This rent control. They're (CDA) all ready to vote yes. Have they thought about both sides? When something comes up, they go along with it, just let things flow. It was wrong to file against the Inner Belt -- just oppose this and that, why not draw up an alternative plan? But they just give a blunt No!

I continue to go because I'm curious what's going on. I go to see what we worked on in the referendum are working out. Everytime I go I see things happen that I was afraid of. (sic)

His curiosity as well as his rebelliousness is motivated by a clear sense of threat or promise to his economic and material situation: as a property owner and entrepreneur, he is interested in a program which could either deprive him of his house of thirty years' inhabitation, through eminent domain, or possibly increase his property value through stopping those kinds of people whom he fears. He has little interest in rent control as a homeowner, as an independent businessman he sees it as a threat to free market bargaining. He showed me a letter he had had published in the Cambridge Chronicle the week before, pointing out the various weaknesses of the concept.

Of all the residents not in a position of formal responsibility, his attendance is the highest, and it is not merely, as might be inferred from the way he refers to his continued participation, that of one who goes to watch the show and say to himself, "I told you so." At almost every meeting, he has something to say, either addressed to substantive proposals or more usually suggestions on how to proceed with more efficiency. When something happens which he "was afraid of" he points this out, reiterating his fear and calling for an alternative.

As must be present in any externally motivated individual, there is a sense of personal efficacy expressed through the political process, and a belief that the particular structure has the possibility of realizing recognized goals. Here both are quite strong. He saw that this agency could have the power to take his house, and he saw himself effective enough that, were he to participate, he "might have a part in deciding what would happen." He is not alienated from the process and he sees it as possibly effective for his own purposes.

Although closer to the professionals in outlook and education than many of their co-residents who take an active part in the Model Cities Program, both Spiros and his wife share strong doubts about the motivations and services which the professionals exhibit. Yet, by many residents, Mr. Spiros would be considered "almost a professional," and his wife also by virtue of her working for a public agency for pay, though previously she was "one of them."

Mr. and Mrs. Spiros, she-dominant counterpoint:

The pros are always job-hopping. If they stay a year they have seniority, two years its exceptional, and

three is unheard of. They move back and forth from one job to another. They keep the neighborhood people stirred up for their own jobs. They can't get jobs in business, so they have to have government jobs. They never give a top job, one over \$10,000, to a resident. It always goes to an outsider, one who doesn't live in the city. They should keep the money in the neighborhood. This is what resident control is, to control all the money. The residents control the vote, but the controlling elements are from outside.

One's attitude to structure is closely bound to one's attitude to the professionals associated with such a program. The Spiros' here seemed to have adopted the programatic view that professionals are a necessary cost, to be borne by any program of this kind. They share a view of politics common to many laymen and political scientists alike: that it is an open market in which power is traded for goals realized, and that each party is competing in its own interest. The professionals offering services are not excluded from this. Any outcome is necessarily a compromise, no one having a monopoly on power.

What I suggested was to organize the ordinance in terms of what opposition you want to meet ...  
Anything should be a coalition government.

Such a view assumes an open access to, and reasonable anticipation of, success over time.

The balance of power he accords to the professionals, for they control the money; but in terms of program outcome, his greatest criticisms are directed not at the professionals, but at the manner in which the structure was formed and the kind of participation it engendered.

When you ask me about resident participation and resident control, they are two different philosophies. The first is unique because it bridges the common gap between the city government and

the people. There is a big gap and maybe the agency (CDA) could fill the gap. The attitude of the agencies is important too. If they are negative, the result is still zero. Resident control depends on a cross section of residents.

Mr.S.: This area was really separated after the referendum. There is more conflict between three and four than before. The reason why I got primarily interested, I thought the so-called CDA would act for the whole neighborhood, act for the funneling agencies, for all the garbage, I call it garbage,- pocket representation, cliques, people in one block, not in the interest of only a few people. The representation on the CDA is not fair enough for the boundaries of Model Cities.

Mrs.S.: There's not one member from the Fletcher School District.

Mr.S.: Yes, Mrs. Dankewitz does, but we wanted fair geographical representation, you know, one person for every eight blocks, something like that. Everyone who ran from the projects, in Area 3, was elected, five people. (Actually, four.) All the benefits, all the subsidies are going back to the projects, that's where all the noise comes from. We're worried about Roosevelt Towers. They're not for the whole community. I'll give you an example: all the teenagers, they got up there last week at the meeting. They passed that resolution right away without thinking. They're talking about Langley building for a recreation center; that's not centrally located. (It's near Roosevelt Towers.) Roosevelt Towers is right next to the school. It could serve. That's pocket representation. The school is open every night up there. We don't know anything about it in this area. Our schools are dumps.

Mrs.S.: Area 4 has no representation on City Council or the School Board; Vellucci got them the school.

Mr.S.: This area isn't considered Area 4, really, the inner core, most of the representation is down by the projects. This is a no man's land. Its in a different school district from them. We couldn't fight the projects. We had 21 candidates in this area. It was a lot more difficult than in



Area 3. You only needed to get 200 votes to win. I think I got more than any winner in Area 3. I got over 400 votes. I went into the projects; but ... I could tell you some stories. They put out a list saying "vote only for these five," instead of voting for all eight. With 700 people in the project, they have a real advantage.

Mrs.S.: Right away you say you live in your own house and they hate you -- you're a land owner.

Mr.S.: Also I was unknown, a lot of them have been doing things for years. This was my first thing in community activities. I was active in the Greek Orthodox Church, on the architects planning board, but that's on the other side of town.

He clearly does not feel that all areas or social groups are represented:

Area 4 has more representation than Area 3, and there is a strong preponderance of project people who don't see eye to eye with those like himself, property owners, independent of government aid.

A lot of the members on the CDA just look at what the others do, they don't think for themselves at all. The projects dominate. As a typical example, we who are residents are concerned that the rubbish is picked up, but the projects have it done for them, they have incinerators, so they could care less. Or another case: for the children crossing to school there is no policeman on the corner of Windsor and Broadway, which I (Mrs. S.) think is one of the most dangerous crossings in the city. But there is one for the crossing at Harvard and Windsor, right across from the projects.

I (Mr. S.) call it subsidizing the subsidized (Model Cities). It's the tax collectors versus the tax payers. And it's the same people spreading themselves around!

Years ago things were very different; the change in residents has been dramatic. Most of the people have moved away. The few of us left are concerned with the people moving in. Do I want the place burned down like with the riots they are having

elsewhere? There's also a philosophical aspect: I had my place taken by the Inner Belt in Somerville. They fought like crazy, but it was pure opposition. They didn't do anything but oppose it. They should have gotten together to plan where to put it, and what it would look like -- now it's the ugliest thing you can imagine, it completely ostracizes (isolates?) the community. They should have been constructive.

With this imbalance of representation goes a style of problem-solving which is antithetical to his own: defensiveness, refusal to develop "constructive alternatives" rather than statements of opposition.

Model Cities depends on the attitude of the board. They have no constructive attitude. They're defensive, they should be open, listen to suggestions: say, 'we have a problem, how do we solve it?' But they don't do that. They have a problem and they say immediately No to it, 'we don't even want to talk about it.' Boom!

Given his economic position and relative independence from government agency regulation, it is natural that he does not share the defensiveness of the project people. The contrasting attitudes, however, do make for tension and depending upon the preponderance of groups of varying views participating in a program-oriented organization, the nature of the process and thus the direction and success of the program will shift. Again, it would seem the less encompassing the set of problems, the less the situation can be defined as a plight and the more it is a problem or problems, susceptible of solution.

When one has relatively little to lose, i.e., questions of survival are not involved (how often are questions of individual survival handled in a political manner), and a relatively strong anticipation of satisfaction in terms

of outcome, one can be "constructive." Mr. Spiros spoke little of specific programatic goals, much of his program would seem to be explained in terms of maintaining his property value, a not unusual view of the homeowner, and one which would not be seen as unreasonable to existing city agencies. He is basically positive in his attitude to the city and what professionals might deem "progress."

One reason I like the city -- I'm in business for myself. I know most of the people around here, and can always get some action, pick something up. (Mrs. S. said she hated it, but I had no time to follow up.)

The Inner Belt is the best thing for Cambridge. It will get all the trucks off the streets. Do you know how many trucks go down this street at 4:00 A.M. in the morning? They wake me up all the time.

Eva Stankunas, the other respondent classified in this group has a definite view of why she is participating (she is an elected member of the CDA) and whom she represents:

I represent the people in this area -- the hard-working people who have come up the hard way, who sometimes have little patience with some of the programs today. 'God helps them who help themselves' -- work hard and you'll get ahead. It's fun to get ahead. My parents both grew up in Lithuania, and they lived like the negroes in the South, in shacks with no floor -- my father told me this because he worked with a negro from the South who told him what it was like there and my father said it was just like that in Lithuania. When we grew up there were three of us girls in one bed; we had one dress apiece and the whole family kept their clothes in one chest -- there was no need for a bureau. When the Depression came and my father was laid off, my sister and I went to work: it was easier for women to get work. We wrapped lollipops. She made \$11-\$12

a week and I made about \$9. We gave it all to my mother and that's what our family of six lived on.

I never felt deprived living here: we have these junk yards next door, but they never bothered me, they gave me something very valuable: privacy, they're like a steel garden. When I told Gordon Brigham (Model Cities Director) this, he thought I was kind of crazy. A lot of people miss this, there is so little place to sit down ... With the junk yards and the school that now has been torn down, I had privacy. Now I see the kinds of people who live on Columbia Street ... Those people over there, look at that house, the little green one. Right next to their front door, the house next to them keeps their garbage cans -- in the summer they sit out there on the front steps and it must get awfully smelly, but they don't do anything. If it was me, I'd insist on my rights to the landlord ... I think they're on welfare, they sit around a lot, look out the window.

It happened accidentally, but we have a very well balanced group of people on the board (CDA), all walks of life ... probably there are some there who have never worked.

Curiosity and a general sense that something might take place that would affect her explain her initial engagement in the program:

I went to the first public meeting. It was advertised in the Chronicle and The Record American. My husband likes to read that, it's got all the Cambridge news on one page, you know. I took my sister and told quite a few people that we should be involved in this.

I was critical of the way Justin Grey was running the meeting. Certain people were monopolizing the meeting, talking all the time and using words like 'legal aid,' CEOC. It was a hand-picked group, and I didn't like it but when I don't like something it just makes me go harder, so I said that I'd go to the next one, and I went to the one after that. At the final meeting, Justin Grey announced that people could volunteer to be on the referendum

committee -- now why did he wait until then to announce it? Well, he announced it and I signed up.

If those people hadn't been so vocal, others might have become involved in this. I guess that Justin Gray took these people as his yeast, the center of the group he was going to build. He didn't come to us maybe because he thought we would be harder to start with. We don't have as much to gain -- they've got jobs that they didn't have before, with CEOC. (This is, as far as I know, not strictly true. Moreover, she is working in a related job in civil service, of which she says, "We used to call it Irish welfare -- that's the way they take care of their own.")

When speaking of what specifically she would like Model Cities to do, she said:

I'd like to see a real Model City, everybody living a little better than they are. I'd like to see a few jobs around here.

The theme of work runs throughout the interview, and there is a strong suspicion of persons on welfare or in the projects, those who haven't made it on their own.

I'm a little wary of the co-operative housing (part of Wellington-Harrington, Urban Renewal) a co-operative to be successful depends on tenant selection. Some of the people in the projects have to be educated -- develop a sense of responsibility to where they live. They should put in people who know how to take care of a building, not tear it down.

With the Model Cities it's like everything else today -- everything has to be easier. At the school, if you make it hard for the kids to pay for the milk, they will steal it, but they'll pay if it's easy for them to do it. This woman I know, her son needed a clean shirt for a dance so instead of taking it down to the machine and putting a quarter in and then ironing it, she

didn't feel like doing the work. She has three TV sets, even though she hasn't paid for the first one yet. She and her husband both work and so do their two boys, but they always have bills, and if they get behind she'll write something -- she writes beautifully and will tell you a real heart-rending story -- you have to know how much is true. A lot of people are like this in the projects. They'll give you the shirt off their backs; give you ten dollars without ever expecting to get it back, but it's a vicious circle, like selling tickets. I never sell tickets for anything, because I'll sell one to this person and one to that, but then they'll come back some time expecting me to buy from them and I'd go broke if I bought them all.

She, too, like Spiros, represents the homeowners against the changes which she sees threatening her neighborhood. But she is not entirely negative: she knows why she likes things as they are and what she would like to see for the future and these ideas are not borrowed from what she has heard others say. Her remark about the privacy of the steel garden struck the professional planner as "kind of crazy" -- so, too, would many planners question the kind of mixed use of which she approves. Hers is a classic apology for the neighborhood concept and illustrates both its strengths and weaknesses.

I told Gordon Brigham that they shouldn't make Model Cities all one space just alike. There should be separate neighborhoods, have some differences in them. You can separate different areas with trees. The new Sennott Park planning is terrible -- it's too busy there's no place to be like Ferdinand, you know, smell the flowers.

This square I really like. It gives you a sense of open space. What's on the square? Analyze it. There's a grocery store, a church, a garage, a funeral parlor, a liquor store. Everything that you need is right here -- even if you die. If I'm a little short of money, the man will still

put gas in my car, and the woman in the store knows everything that's going on in the area -- she's as good as WCAS (local news station). There's a library up the street and a swimming pool and a bus stop that takes you to Harvard Square or Central Square. Where else can you get so much. For convenience, there's everything you need. I visited my daughter in Anaheim (California) and you couldn't get a loaf of bread without getting in the car. When she was going through college, I took a job right up the street with Hyde Shoe. I could have gotten better pay elsewhere, but here I saved carfare and I could come home for lunch.

Privacy, the separation of neighborhoods, and local convenience are her concerns. Behind the first two is a concern for property values and a suspicion of people different from herself. There is not a strong community sense in a larger context. But she has an alert mind and is open to ideas:

On WCAS the other day, they said that they have a record of the voting of all the members of the state legislature. That would be a good thing to put in the libraries, so you could go down and see how someone voted on some issue. You can't do that now unless you go through all the trouble of going to the State house. Also, they should keep the library open on Saturday and Sunday, this is when people have free time. A lot of people read around here and maybe they could get together and discuss some book, and each person could tell what it means to them. I'm reading lots of interesting things now. My son sends me books from time to time that he thinks I'd be interested in. A little while ago he sent me Confucius. I found that had a lot of interesting ideas. There's ideas in there for Model Cities.

You know what changed my life, the thing that really did it? Ten years ago I got on a jet and flew across the country to visit my daughter in California. I'm a different person. I said to myself, "I'm behind the times." I had a low level of aspirations. We never had a goal, things just happened and we went along with it. I never planned that my children

would go to college, when the time came they were just lucky to get scholarships.

Given exposure to people of varying views, and the exigencies of the political process, which she seems willing to accept, it is not inconceivable that she might modify some of her more rigid views. Like most of those so far, Mrs. Stankunas has a strong sense of her own efficacy, and one which can find expression in the political process:

I'm different from my sister, she doesn't believe you can fight City Hall. I like to think you can. Some people say that whatever you do nothing will happen. I'm out to find this is not true ... or true. They asked me why I keep doing things like this. I hate to believe that you have no say in your life. I believe if you work hard enough you can change the course of history. Work hard and you can get what you want. As an example that new house on the corner -- my brother built it. They wanted to build that club that's now over on Harvard Street, the Lithuanian one, here. Everyone was for it, the priest thought it was a good idea, he wanted a teen center and a bowling place, but we were against it, and a lot of people thought we were unfaithful to our group, Lithuanians, you know, but we didn't want it in our neighborhood. The noise, a liquor license would bring noisy people and trouble, so my husband organized the people around here. We went up to City Hall and stopped them from giving them permission to build.

She has had proof that if people organize they can get what they want, or at least stop others' action. Some of this is a character trait; her sister does not take the same case as evidence of the individual's power. Mrs. Stankunas also is responding to a vision which does not accept defeat: "When I don't like something, it just makes me go harder." She holds firmly to the belief that in our society the individual does count.



All this is consonant with the American dream of success through work, through an individual's initiative. As a first-generation American, she has successfully internalized America's myths. She has a strong sense of gratitude for those who helped her and looks ruefully upon others who do not share her behavior patterns.

When I was a young girl working in the factory, a social worker from the Margaret Fuller got us involved there. It makes me cry, now, to see it. We used to want to go there because it was nicer than our own house. They had an upstairs sitting room with a real fireplace and a place with cushions, and we loved to go there.

After the Margaret Fuller I joined the YWCA, and got involved with some people from Bryn Mawr. They had a convention out in Canton or Wayland. All the factory girls were taken in different groups to women's homes. I stayed with this very nice woman, she drove me in the mornings to the meetings and I had a bedroom to myself. I guess this was to let us see something better. They don't do this now, but maybe the kids don't need it. They have the chance with their radio and the TV and cars.

The Margaret Fuller is now generally used by black youngsters, and does not give off the sense of genteel uplift it had for her.

Her external motivation, to preserve the neighborhood populated by hard working people, is greater than internal ones. But, as happens with active participants, one motivation often encourages the other, and in attending to the realization of her specific goals -- what she wants out of the program -- she indicated to me that she is becoming increasingly familiar with the process of the politics of such participation, and that she is gaining confidence in herself as an operator (not pejorative), which she finds enjoyable.

Both she and Mr. Spiros are "fighters" and glean some enjoyment from the fight.

I've always held back from saying things if I thought that they might bother some people, but now maybe I should shed that skin and start saying what I really think, be a little rude with some of the board. It's awfully easy to know someone's weaknesses and how to make them mad after you've been with them for awhile.

Although she participated, it wasn't without suspicion of the professionals or whom she saw them representing: the educational institutions, M.I.T., and Harvard. Although not economically dependent upon them, she does hold the professional in awe, the awe of the less-educated for the degree holder.

One of my questions about the board is, are we being computerized? I mean when an important person like President Johnson of M.I.T. spends five hours talking to a group of people who don't make any sense -- would ask a person who is not a success how to be successful? I don't know now, but at first I thought that the computer had thought out all our reactions and Harvard and M.I.T. want Model Cities to ... with NASA here there will have to be housing, they'll want to change the neighborhood to make it attractive for them. I don't think the stated goals of keeping the neighborhood like it is is really wanted. A lot of people look around and don't believe this, especially if they have to live in a bad neighborhood.

Not seeing herself, or the other residents like her, capable of "making sense," she is suspicious of President Johnson of M.I.T. "wasting his time" with them. Nor can she quite believe the intentions of this program. But for her, as for others less dependent on the professional, the professional does not pose an explicit threat, there is little sense that their motives

are based on altruism. Like the rest of the world, they are guided in their actions by self-centered motivations, and respond to certain pressures and attractions:

The professionals are trying to help us, but you have to know people's reasons: money, politics. Some of the professionals on the staff (Model Cities) are amateurs, do-gooder amateurs of which there is nothing worse. If I was running it, I'd start pulling a few threads together. I expect professional behavior from professionals. Some of them come in and say, 'Well, I don't know very much about this, but here's what I think.' If they're professional, they should know what they're talking about, or they shouldn't say anything.

5 - Middle America (Mi, Mx)

This group is analogous to the one which political scientists are fond of studying, and politicians wooing: "the swing vote." They are not highly motivated either by grave personal needs, or by strongly perceived program goals, yet neither are they either antagonistic or uninterested in participation of this nature on principle. This view is more apt to be skepticism, than cynicism, curiosity rather than enthusiasm. They probably have to be convinced of the worth of their effort, but they are willing to be convinced. Alan Ringrose, a supply coordinator for an industrial firm, a reserve naval officer whose hobby is economic geography, had this to say:

The entire concept of Model Cities in theory is good, but by the time it gets down to the practical level, nine out of the ten dollars will be siphoned off and the one dollar won't be enough to do the job. In the fall they had elections, must be almost a year ago. We went down to St. Mary's, it was cold, ice was on the steps, must be a year now, when Justin Grey had his first seminar, and I said this is another boondoggle--I have a very negative opinion of Justin Grey: Mr., I Am the King sitting up there on a podium, pomposity. He gave very little explanation that night, he was acting a half-assed parliamentarian, shutting up people, he had a salted audience. (people planted)

At this point Mrs. Ringrose, who was listening, added:

One man got up to ask a question and Mr. Grey told him that he should know that because it had been in the paper. The poor man sat down, and he was so embarrassed that he left. I felt so sorry for him. There was no reason to snap at him the way he did, maybe he hadn't seen the paper.

Mr. Ringrose continued:

I went to three or four more meetings, because it affects my area. But I don't think it's going to get off the ground. They only have X dollars and there will be some retrenchment. Model Cities is just another fill-up, a sop for the people until they put the Belt in. It might serve to stop the Belt but I don't think it will. The Belt Route is desired by the two major universities. The electoral system helps this. Crane is in the backpocket of Harvard so it's rumored. It's (Belt Route) a good deal for the wheelbarrow contractors; it's not a good plan, there're other routes, straight down the river, but build a bridge and you make money, or a tunnel and you make even more. Shouldn't take a Ph.D. to develop a few one-way routes in and out. Somebody's going to make a bundle. If it hadn't been for the Vietnam War it would already be done.

Control is still in City Hall. If the powers-that-be in City Hall choose to, they can still screen the recommendations. If you want to change things, you change the people: you vote every four years.

Mrs. Ringrose:

The people aren't interested.

Mr. Ringrose:

Part of the reason is that some own their homes and some rent. Those who pay taxes try to save the pocketbooks.

There was ample publicity for Model Cities, fliers, automobiles constantly. The election went just the way I figured: each little group put their person in, which is as it should be.

I couldn't run, I'm not a political animal. It was something to see Eliot Richardson, when he came to the plant, begging, actually begging, like a mendicant, who hadn't eaten for ten years, for votes.

The meetings are great for Justin Gray, he's making something for himself. I know if I gripe, I should go join the CDA and start at the bottom licking

stamps, and work up like in a lodge, but I've got no time. I'm tired....

I'm a Truman Democrat, Wilkey Republican, the old line. (Pause.) There's stuff now available if you look for it. If you want employment, go to the Employment Agency or look in the newspaper, you don't need a superstructure.

(Talking to the window.) Look at that lot there. It used to be a playground. Then the city took it for a parking lot. Three hundred out of three hundred sixty-five days there's nothing there. They could put a set of units of housing there, but probably they never thought about it, yet they're crying about the shortage of land. How can you say the government will do something? If you told Model Cities about it, they would say. "Good idea. We need housing", but it would go into the circular file. Why do I say that? That space has been there for years, and they haven't done anything. This area has no political muscle, the power is in North Cambridge, with the Lace Curtain Irish. Model Cities couldn't push something past City Hall.

Something that no one has considered is that in a few years, this whole area will undergo a huge change. When the old ethnic people die, like my wife's father, who lives downstairs, then we'll move. And there are a lot like us.

There is an ambivalence here in almost every area. He is not alienated from the political system, and he thinks that Model Cities is a good idea, but he doubts their power, and their responsiveness, and he has little regard for the city's politics. He does not discount all professionals, but finds reason to resent the particular one he observed most recently. He has sound reasons for external motivation, living on the street that the Belt Route is slated to destroy, yet he can mitigate their urgency by planning to leave the area. His internal motivation is not high enough to turn him into a "mendicant" but it was not so low

that it deterred him from attending the initial meetings.

Neither his future participation in the Model Cities Program, or in other programs could be safely predicted from analysis of his present position, ceteris paribus.

Another respondent in this group, Mrs. Brysinski, a Polish woman in her 40's, had this to say:

I read about it (Model Cities) in the Cambridge Chronicle first about two years ago. They didn't appropriate the money but they were talking about it (the idea of Model Cities). I was living elsewhere in Cambridge at the time (further down in E. Cambridge) but I thought it was a pretty good idea.

I voted for it--it's very good. (But she had attended no meetings. They had moved here in August). We're just trying to get straightened out here. No time yet, working on my property, doing work on these three apartments. (She kept a very neat house and the general appearance of the building was good.) Perhaps I can't speak out as well as others, possibly my husband would be better. But he works Saturdays and on Sunday he works on the house, and sometimes when he comes home he plain goes to bed.

I thought Wellington-Harrington was a part of Model Cities. The mailman brought this (W-H) to my attention, and a W-H woman came in here.

She felt quite strongly about the following, talking about it for about five minutes:

The streets should be kept cleaner; there's litter all about. I tell my son to put his candy wrappers in his pocket--I bet you don't--but if he sees everybody else throwing them in the street, he's

not going to do that.

What could be done?

If enough people complain, but city council or anybody like that isn't interested, or somebody would notice. In our group (a Polish-American's veterans group), we talk about this all the time (the litter). But people are different today; they just don't want to do anything. When I was growing up, we were all immigrants, the immigrants today too, everyone used to go out and sweep in front and try and keep things clean.

(Her view of government seems to me a fairly common one: that normally government does not take the initiative, but if pressured will respond in some way to the peoples' wants, squaring with Banfield's description of the politicians desire to conserve power in Political Influence.)

Although she shows a certain hesitation in getting involved, this seems more as a standard deference to the "better qualifications" of the husband, and would not in probability seriously hinder her activity. She already shows the concern of other homeowners such as Mr. Spros and Mr. Stanknas over the state of the neighborhood and how its mores are changing, but has used the social ethnic club rather than the political apparatus as the means for voicing dissatisfaction. Perhaps the motivation is largely internal and merely giving voice by presenting a topic of conversation, this need is met. But that is not certain; she does show a sense of neatness in her house and in the way she brings up her child, a sense of order and regularity that could lead her to participate if she felt that things were getting too bad and Model Cities presented a



mechanism for salvaging those values and way of life she holds important.

The next case is that of Mildred Hanright, age 40's, separated.

When I ask people to go to a meeting the first thing they ask me is, "What can Model Cities do for me?" When Model Cities hasn't set any priorities what can I say to that? Nothing. All the areas are not represented on Model Cities--the upper end of Elm, Norfolk and Tremont Streets are totally, completely in the dark. I don't know why. Maybe they feel more like they're in Somerville, they're close to the line. In the early organizing we never even heard about it. We would hear about a Model Cities meeting at St. Mary's but we didn't know anything about it. We didn't know what a Model City was. The first piece of literature I ever got from Model Cities was a thing with writing on both sides and a map on the bottom with a lot of fine print like on an insurance policy. How many people bother to read a thing like that through? If they want people to participate they shouldn't send this out. If will go right in the ash can-- people will look at it, see Model Cities, but won't read farther and throw it away. The people in this area like to be shown something, we proved that at the unveiling of the Sennott Park plan. If they want participation they should put up a billboard down at Sennott Park showing what the area is going to look like. Then you'll get hundreds of people.

I went to the first meeting (her first) out of curiosity, I like to get behind the scenes, I don't take anything for granted, as my husband said, I'm a brain-picker. I analyze everything. The way we heard about it was the sound truck, I think. We went to it thinking it would be like the Belt Route meetings with everyone speaking, but it was pretty cut and dried, going down an agenda they had. They were busy, but we felt that we didn't know any more about Model Cities when we walked out than when we walked in. Six of us went together. When we came out Mrs. Dankewitz decided to run because it looked like it would affect her neighborhood.

Justin Gray is a very good speaker; at first he struck us as a middle-aged hippie, but he's very good, a brain (pointing to her head significantly). You know that he likes people, that he's working for the people. I've never heard anything bad about him. Those who know him all like him. The board itself has to show concern and be enthusiastic in every phase of what they are doing. A project that comes up in East Cambridge as well as one in their own area. If they are just out for themselves, they won't even bother to vote.

People have an erroneous feeling that people who are not in as well financial circumstances as others are looked down upon. They feel they have a common cause and that there is a common bond that links them together. They are there together to begin with -- most of them are in a housing project. If you're looking for people to start something, it would be easier to get those already grouped together. The organizers for Model Cities probably went to groups like this (the poor project people) or a PTA. It's so much easier than going to a neighborhood like this and going from door to door, and have it slam in your face. There's definitely better representation from the projects than from homeowners. Information can be gotten to them so much more easily, there are tenants councils, the Wellington-Harrington Citizens Council. This area doesn't have any specifically formed groups, not even a congregate group of a PTA. We're interracial; we have a synagogue, a Lutheran church, and St. Mary's -- which I think is good.

That's (a group to represent them) what the elderly have with the Services for the Elderly, and the hot lunch program, where they can meet and pass information to one another. We don't have this and here we are without representation. This is not the way to get things done, we need our own group. We have no common church or common....I don't go for that principle; I believe in mix, but we need something like a citizens' association to keep us informed.

Most of the people here are homeowners, third or fourth generation. This house has been passed down from my grandfather to my grandmother to my father then my

mother and some day to me. My son thinks this is the perfect place to live, but he's only 15. Probably when he goes to college he'll change his mind and want to go to California.

Most of the people in this area aren't used to change. They think they're pretty staid and secure -- which I think is wrong. Nothing today is secure.

That factory there, it's owned by Mr. Dormitzer on the board (CDA). There are rumors that he's going to move and everybody is talking about it, but no one is organizing anything. Ten years ago when we fought his coming in it did no good, but today it's different. Times are changing--listen to the philosopher--but that's what I learned going to these meetings, that's why I think that people should get out. As an example of what can be done, there's a parking ban on both sides of this street, which makes it hard for someone to park if guests come or the doctor stops. So I went around the neighborhood and got 62 signatures and we spoke to Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ (in the traffic department) and he agreed with us and the bank is going to be removed.

I don't want the neighborhood to decay, go downhill any more than it has. The grandparents were too interested in fixing up their own little property. They weren't thinking about what's going on around them -- that's wrong. I'm going to start a campaign for spraying the trees again, and working on the schools.

I don't know if I would have gotten involved if I hadn't known Mrs. Kankewitz, maybe not though. I know Mrs. Young. People have to have some personal contact, more apt to go.

People know that I always go to meetings so they ask me to do this or that, but don't do it themselves. Most of the people think they're secure. They have the attitude that you can't change anything--in the past they probably have tried. When a factory was expanding on the next street there, Mrs. Seldon got

the lawyer and went to the zoning board, but it didn't work; the factory still was allowed. But times are changing. People are listened to more. The government is finally realizing it's the people who pay the taxes, support the country, and make the economics of the country. Maybe it's that people are finally starting to work together. People before had the feeling that people in one area didn't care about people in another. Now people realize it's not just one neighborhood that's important, but the composite of them. That's why it hurts me to see one neighborhood well-represented and others like those I mentioned not represented, not explained to. I can't go along with the squabbling over area 3, area 4. If they improve the school in one area, the curriculum for instance, it will spread through the city, it's just logical that the city wouldn't improve just one school.

For my husband politics is nonsense, federal, county, or local. Probably another reason I might not have gotten involved (her husband is not living with her now, having left her last year). A man is apt to look at his job, maintaining his home, but he did attend labor meetings, and I followed all the negotiating points, I knew what was going on so I probably would get involved with Model Cities. My husband got involved with city politics. I had gone through school with Goldberg and he called us asking for our support. We gave a luau for him and my husband was really active, but I bet he hasn't even voted in the last two city elections. With the labor union his pocketbook was directly affected and Goldberg contacted us as personal friends; he established a relationship there, these affect us directly.

Women have more time, when children are grown up. When a man's been working all day, he likes to come home and put his feet up and watch TV, not bother his mind. Women are around home all day, can contact others. Half the time a woman's time is spent on the telephone, have to talk about something, so talk about Model Cities. There are other pressures on men today, working to get ahead on the job, making ends meet. If a man does go, he has to be awfully enthusiastic. It must have something to do with the man himself, his personal makeup.

I don't believe that housing projects are the answer to the housing shortage. The housing projects are the slums of tomorrow. That's a saying I heard as a child, I can remember it so far back. It was said by people who didn't want them built. Back in those days, it was thought to be the answer, today I don't think they are. But it's a shame that they have to fight so hard to get them modernized, when it's something that should just be done. The people aren't supposed to paint the walls themselves.

Her interview is the most explicit in documenting an attitude of change due in good part to the operations of structural organizations. She sees change coming to her neighborhood and to the country -- people are effectively getting together in organization, in her mind, as they weren't able to do even 10 years ago. And people's province of responsibility she notices has changed since her grandparent's time: she is looking beyond her neighborhood to a view of the community as a whole.

Mrs. Hanright shares the belief of the externally motivated person that she can change the life around her and she can cite small victories. Her financial condition is fairly stable, as a homeowner one would place her in the lower-middle class and one who doesn't have to work. It is probable, no crisis situation threatening her, that her scope of demands will ~~remain~~ small -- on the order of spraying trees, and working for better schools (not a theoretically small demand, but in actuality usually limited in goals and often having little to do with the educational aspects, i.e., a better-lighted lunchroom.). Being of a limited nature, her demands have a good chance of being met and her acceptance of the mechanism as viable, is not unreasonable. In the same way her intensity

for a particular goal is not, or need not be, that high. Her internal motivation of curiosity and friendship was the initial motivator, as it will probably be in future participation.

Her analysis of participation in politics is mainly a social one, both for herself and her husband; those needs which are met for a man in his job, a sense of worth or personal contact with others, can be met for a woman through local participation. But little regard is paid here to participation in terms of goal achievement, except for her reference to her husband's union work, which "effected his pocketbook." The kinds of problems dealt with, this structure specifically, and politics generally, it seems, are not crucial to his world, don't effect his pocketbook, and thus do not generate the requisite sense of urgency, which she implies is needed for the man.

For her the structure, in imparting a sense of change and appearing to her as an agent of change with the necessary power, has given both focus and faith to her external motivation. As the structure discusses possible changes, bringing up new ideas, it is likely that she would expand her perceived needs as means for their satisfaction are met. She will incorporate other goals besides trees and schools, as the structure suggests them.

She displays little suspicion of professionals or politicians. She has a good word for Justin Gray and having gone to school with a city councillor, City Hall does not intimidate. Her questions of success in

structural terms are more directed at the ability of the board to organize themselves, to not squabble, and to represent the area as a whole and not to be "just out for themselves." She recognizes that the projects are more strongly represented than other groups (for reasons she can in some part accept.) As a homeowner she may question whether her interests will be recognized but she does not seem upset about this.

Her attitude toward professionals and to the structure is reflective of her economic position: needing and expecting less from professionals, not having been dependent upon them in the past for her housing, or her income, she has less reason to suspect them. But she can see a possible threat to her goals from persons whose needs are not the same as hers due to their different economic position. She does not question her access to power and as an observer she need have no constituency but herself, though she does recognize that if her area of third and fourth generation homeowners had some kind of organization, they would have better representation. If the structure developed qualities which she saw as inimical, her behavior could follow one of two paths, either to organize her neighbors as a group so as to make their intent known, as she did with the parking ban, or to withdraw, not seeing the Model Cities as that critical to her life. For she has relatively low priority goals, and ones which she might see accomplished by other means. Given her moderate position, whether she does one or the other is to some extent able to be influenced by how the structure indicates to her its interest in her.

I interviewed Oakley S. in a neighborhood bar the morning of Nixon's inauguration. He struck me as a person with a perceptive, open mind, one who might be a valuable contributor to any organization planning for the neighborhood. While he might have responded as he did because he felt it was the right thing to say, there seems to be enough substance in what he said to indicate that he was not merely repeating a cliché. The interview was spread over an hour and a half, being interspersed by attention and observations on the proceedings on TV. He seemed perfectly at ease from the beginning, possibly because I set out to interview the bar owner and ended up interviewing Oakley, who injected himself as a kibitzer. His final statement is the most definite statement he made on the Model Cities Program, but is not contrary to the skepticism and sense that essentially the program is not aimed at him. Its tenor seems to me akin to the declaration that a blitzkrieg would be helpful. Alongside such statements of simplification are sound observations on the workings of city and suburb.

The first time I heard about Model Cities was when Vellucci's daughter came to my house and asked me what I would like to have in the neighborhood. Two months later she came back to ask me to vote. She got my name off the voting roles. (This sounds to me like W-H project, as Vellucci's daughter is a member of the W-H Citizen Committee). I'm legally blind, can't read the newspapers, but I watch Channel 2 and listen to WEEI and WCAS. I voted for the program but I didn't attend any of the meetings. I assumed it was to help the landlords to get an easier loan. My wife voted, she voted for it, for the name-- Model City-- you know, betterment, not that she doesn't....

The government is willing to put in small projects but the communities won't open up, they will not integrate....



all that land's going to waste. They ought to put small projects, 25 family units, and move into the suburbs, that's where the land is. I don't care if your color is black or white, if you need it, you need it. Have it so you own your own apartment. Germany is better off because of the blitzkrieg -- they ought to wipe it (Model Cities area) out and start over. All the buildings are over 75 years old. Ninety percent of the houses haven't been shingled in 60 years. On the surface all the citizens have participated in the program. The city officials haven't tried to dominate it, but the residents haven't done zilch. They goofed by arguing by themselves. They spent all the time on planning. They've got no money, what can you do without money? If you saw something taking place you'd get on the bandwagon, but I haven't seen anything. I wasn't interested at the time -- I'm like the rest: everyone says let the other guy do it -- I was too blasé. I'm all for the young though. The people involved are mostly homeowners. The people paying the rent say "What's in it for me?", they're paying the rent to the landlord, we get zilch. (He's a renter.) Model Cities is good though, they put that little playground in Marcella Court. (Throughout the interview the respondent confused Model Cities and Wellington-Harrington Urban Renewal, which did the playground. When I pointed this out, the bartender asked, "On that side of the street is Urban Renewal and on this side, Model Cities, how is that?")

They shouldn't have a central place for meeting, use empty stores to hold the meetings.

Model Cities is a waste of time -- there's no room here in Cambridge.

Are his criticisms or attitudes sufficient to remove him from participation?

I would think not. Oakley is not unfavorable towards either the government or Model Cities. One substantive reservation, that the program is for homeowners, is in fact caused by confusion between Model Cities program and the Urban Renewal program of which the latter is largely aimed at

homeowners (allowing below market interest rates for loans, etc.) It would take little to establish the differing nature of the programs, at least in terms of stated goals.

To me Oakley seems representative of a great number of his fellow citizens, perceptive of his area, reasonable in discussion, with some sound thoughts, aware of general processes taking place but not clear on specifics -- and completely uncommitted to participation.

His implied feeling that the young are the motivating force of the program does not seem a real issue if examined. His age, middle forties, does not put him outside the participant category at all. His complaint that the residents have "goofed by arguing among themselves" is a common one heard, and is not without reason; but it is often more apt to be the observation of an outsider about any organization, than to be made by someone who has followed actual deliberations. His sense of efficacy as expressed through political processes is not clear. By his statement that city hall has not tried to dominate it, but that the citizens themselves have been the cause of the poor performance he indicates a flexibility in attitude towards established politicians and a belief that citizens can be a factor in the process, if in a negative way. Much of the criticism seems a problem of communication, misunderstanding and confusion, a sense that it's for others, younger, or that no sense of action has been communicated: "If you saw something take place you'd get on the bandwagon..." Of course whether he would get on the bandwagon is the basic question, and maybe he still would "let the other guy do it." But this is open to question.

His participation might well hinge on the amount of personal contact which the Model Cities Program established with him.

6. "All the World's a stage....." (Hi Mx)

The people in this group constitute those whose personal reward or anticipation of personal reward is greater than the reward or anticipated reward derived from realization of external goals, but who do recognize and hold the latter. Of the 4 interviewed, none showed a disbelief in the political system. All of them exhibit pleasure in the kind of personal exchange and contact which a public meeting provides; with the exception of Pat, all are strong extroverts, forceful people pulling others along in their wake. Pat was one who was pulled in by another highly-motivated person interviewed in this study, Janet.

In Pat's case, the more self-reliant and powerful Janet provides the reassurance on a personal level which allows Pat to work for goals she has but would normally be fearful of working to achieve. Speaking of the peoples' involvement in community affairs over the years she said, : "A lot are afraid to speak up; in the projects they are afraid of being evicted or those on ADC afraid of losing their check. I was afraid before, until I learned that they can't get at me. I'd call Jan and she knows a lot of people and I know a lot who would speak up for me..

You're afraid to get involved with people you don't know. And Model Cities was just getting started. I got involved with the recreation committee (of the neighborhood planning team sponsored by Poverty program) and we got a tot lot which was what I wanted. Mr. Warren got involved by first helping with the kids in the tot lot -- his own were there -- and then taking that over. That led to then working there for the Commonwealth Service Corp."

I used to think all politicians were pretty nice; I didn't know anything about the neighborhood.

More people are taking part in things today around the neighborhood.

I think MC started it and people are getting tired of being pushed around by politicians -- look at the Boston taxpayers revolt. Model Cities started the idea of resident control. They are the only ones who put it in and they are telling the politicians what to do. Money talks, all the cities need money, especially with federal cutbacks."

Like Janet eight years ago, Pat was afraid to participate; now she is taking on positions of responsibility (Board Director of CEOC) and gaining increasing knowledge of what is right or wrong in her neighborhood with the confidence and power to act upon this knowledge. When Janet said "I think this neighborhood is shaping up" and related how people will continue to act as they see what they can do, I'm sure that she had people like Pat in mind.

For her, and now Pat, politics is a question of power, who has it, and how you take it. Without the support that Jan and Jan's connections could give her she could not feel safe making demands on the existing structures. But having this support, she can.

She has a sense of her own efficacy and power which stems from personal friendships and connections. From the political power and reflection of it in the way she can see others act towards her group, grows I think a sense of personal worth and value which for her is a more important reward than any specific goal, though the judgment is based on impressions gathered over a summers contact with her, extending beyond this single interview.

Of course, Pat's case holds a serious charge against the representativeness of public institutions and the access the poor have to decision-making. Clearly the patron or sponsor kind of politics of which this is a type is not a vehicle capable of involving large numbers of people. Institutions which have power, which can counter those which intimidate the poor, must be established, ideally by the poor themselves, whether political, economic, or hopefully a combination of the two.

Rita, is vice chairman of the CDA and one of its most vociferous members. Model Cities was the first community activity in which she took part. Her immediate motivation was boredom, though underlying this seems to be a resentment over her powerlessness and a will to get back at those she sees as exerting power over her.

"I was very bored with my existence. That has a lot to do with it -- people's individual lives. I first heard about Model Cities through the CEOC planning team. Sue White, their organizer, had contacted me. I had just got out of high school and was bored. I went to the planning team meeting because I was interested in adult education, I wanted to learn some more, and Sue said there might be something for me there."

"I went back to school so I could tell off people in a nice way. Everybody who has good jobs, the professionals could tell you you were a jerk in a nice way, because of education. Now I know I went back for the wrong reason. I wanted to use education as a whip."

"One of the reasons I participate is that I want to reeducation myself for my self esteem....I've found that a lot of people don't feel that way."

Education she sees as the key to power, and she views her participation as both an education in itself and as a means to getting a formal education, through the contacts she has made, the information she now has access to, and her position. She has recently started a government sponsored program to train "sub-professionals" for nutrition and home care. Participation has meant getting a share of the pie, increasing her self esteem by increasing her economic independence and political strength.

"I'm going to move now, I've got a future. In the next five years, I don't know whether I'll be a politician, or a professional, like a social worker, but I'm going now."

In participating she has moved from a position of hostility, her reference to her "wrong reason" for wishing to be educated, to accommodation....

"At first I felt that everyone is a rat fink, and that Model Cities was a big bag job -- that the city would take all the money, but I entered it because I thought it was time to do something to change things."

She still is suspicious of any professional, but now she is willing to work with them for she has a strong sense of her own power and political efficacy. "I proved it myself that you can change things, after I was refused public housing when I had been burnt out. I called the governor and all over the city. I felt that the governor was responsible if the city couldn't do the job. I'd had enough. I was either going to make it or crack."

"I changed my mind about the pros after the ordinance was written up. I saw that professionals and residents can work together. You've got to have a C.O. but they can be dangerous if they try to solve all your problems. They should be a source of information."

Rita is a doer (call the Governor?) and she gains a sense of herself through her dealings with other people. As she shows in the following quotation, she is very much a salesman, needing to place her position before others and engaging in the game of persuasions, of bringing others to share her position: "I want to get something for my children. I'm not a great humanitarian, you know, I'm doing something for my family, setting a what you call it, a precedent. By the time my Jean Marie is 21 years old, things will be easier for her. I sell Model Cities because I believe it is the answer to a lot of the things -- the dirty, old political system, the future of our children, (not the ones that are rebelling today.) I can sell it to the people if you give them to me. But a lot of the board doesn't believe in it. They don't know about it, weren't involved in the early part and don't know why a lot of things are in the ordinance. And some of them don't speak up. Like at that meeting on Sennott Park. Why if that were my park I'd...but she (another member) didn't speak strongly, even for it.

She does have goals and hopes for change in the future, but they are not specific. She could mention specific projects she is interested in; she is fighting very hard on urban renewal housing projects in her area, but she puts her participation in terms of how she operates in the process, elements more closely tied to personal needs and personal expression.

Another salesman of participation is Ester, a young Black mother who lives in the projects. She showed me the brochure of the kitchen and home equipment she is selling on a "your own free time" basis. She got the idea of doing it, as she explained to me "from going around explaining



to people about Model Cities, and why they should vote for the referendum. Going up to people who you don't know and trying to convince them of something is not easy, but I enjoyed it and I figured that if I could do that, I could sell anything. So when I heard about this I thought I'd try it."

"There's lots of reasons I participate. I enjoy mixing with people. I like to find out different things. It's an educational thing. I had just got separated, that was something in my case. I was talking with this fellow I grew up with who was involved in a lot of things. He was on a neighborhood committee reviewing something about city administration, and he asked me why I didn't do something. I didn't want Head Start because it took up too much time. I looked over the selection. I called CBOC and talked to the C.O. there. Health interested me and he referred me to a woman who was in charge of the Health Task Force. On the task force we went to different agencies in the city to see what service they provided and who was eligible, and put the information together for people to know about. When I moved here, I just had my baby, the night I moved in, but I wanted to get involved."

"I wanted to run. It's just fun to meet people. You learn a lot of things, rumors and things. I found a lot of people don't know what's going on. A lot would like to know -- elderly people and others could be used if they could be brought out or people could talk to them. If you weren't out there you'd never hear."

Participation is activity; it provides escape from the loneliness of separation; it allows you to meet people and you learn rumors and things.

Whether this kind of .. return .. sustains real committment is a question. She herself implies some doubt:

"Would I run again? That's a question. My main feeling is that maybe it's too much time, there seems to be too many meetings -- but I don't know. It would depend on how they are doing."

Scott Greer has suggested 'that the pattern of participation of a locality influences individual rates of participation, distinct from their SES or life style:

"What hit me first, just going around the neighborhood was that there was greater enthusiasm and involvement here than in any other part of Cambridge. It makes it easier on you to have others doing these things with you. I don't know exactly why this area is so active, maybe its because there are more people who don't own their own homes, more poor people here than in other areas -- where I grew up in Cambridgeport a lot of people owned their own homes. It's hard to get people out from their homes -- they don't feel they have to worry until it hits home. Renters are alone, they have the same problems, with landlords."

Certainly Esther seems to corroborate Greer to some extent in stating that her area (area 4), by having greater involvement made it easier for her as an individual to participate than it had been in Cambridgeport. But since she participated in both areas one cannot assign a degree of determining effect. She ascribes the greater involvement in area 4 to the greater preponderance of renters as opposed to the homeowners in Cambridgeport. This may place the causation on SES and possibly life style causality at variance with most of the literature (which finds greater participation among middle class than lower).

While she has a natural confidence in herself, she sees political power for "the people" more as a potential than an actual fact. At this point theirs is a limited power, with the distribution held largely by those with money or their hired help, the professional:

"One thing that strikes me how much power people have -- one thing showed me: the first visit to City Hall. The more people you have this bothers City Hall. There is power in numbers, this I still believe. There are some things you can't change but you can do little things and then the big things happen. If you just get out there the day the thing is going to be passed you can't do much. You just don't have enough numbers. I don't think that people are all bad -- we can get some good from them. Some are bad to deal with, the professionals. They are always prepared before hand. And you just learn of their plans when they are about to do them. Now I think that the professionals had their plans (for Model Cities) all ready. The pros will still control things but if you have enough people you can scare them. But they don't worry because they know people will never come out. Professionals are money conscious more than anything. They can make it better with people who have it. The little people aren't going to give you too much because they don't have it."

This attitude can explain in part why lower class participants may be more process oriented, than those participants who were more project oriented (high external motivation) and middle class. The middle class has more money and views more congruent with the professional (less disruptive in terms of radical changes, more for maintenance of the status quo with reformist improvements like bettering the neighborhood, which is an implicit economic question for them and an explicit one for the low income person who might have to move), and thus both attitudes support

power with which to join the fight for specific changes. As there is less hope of success in terms of program and project outcome if the less powerful participate it is likely that they will look to personal needs which can be met by the process and their continued participation will hinge in part on the recognition and/or responsibility which that process can give them. To my mind this is not a healthy basis for participation if that is the extent of the reward, but as a factor in structuring a program so that people will participate it could be used well, given the program was aimed at real solutions for the problems of the less powerful people.

Barbara Askins, the final respondent in this category is a short heavy woman who laughs at her own vehemence but nonetheless maintains her outspoken opinions. She is active in several neighborhood groups, such as the board of the settlement house, and like Mrs. Fahy works at Tutoring Plus, the tutoring program which was set up by the mothers in the neighborhood for their children.

Barbara enjoys the process and saw herself enough of a political type to run for the CDA board though she lost:

"I ran for the CDA board - got interested in it at the 11th hour. I didn't realize it would be such a political thing. It got to be cut-throat. I would like to have a say in Area 4.- I should say Area 3, too, but I know more about 4."

Since that time her participation has been minimal, and for this reason she will receive more detailed presentation in the section dealing with those who were inclined to participate but have not.

7. Potential Altruist (Li Mx)

The final category of participation inclined respondents contains one person who owns a small one-room clothing store. She took it over from her father when he got too old to manage it. Above the store are several cold water apartments which she rents for thirty to forty dollars per month.

Q. When did you first become aware of Model Cities Program?

A. It was almost two years ago when they first applied for it. Johnson came out with some federal money to allot to cities to upgrade them.

Cambridge was one of sixteen cities to apply-- have you seen the literature?

I have it.

Q. How did they contact you?

A. They put up posters in my window. I was all for that.

Although she isn't a resident, she has taken considerable interest in the program and has definite ideas about what could be done to improve the area:

"I can see this area to be used for a beautiful apartment for low income people, for families, and for the elderly if the new project isn't enough. But if they don't change (their plans) - only put in parking and not widen Warren Street, which feeds into Somerville and is already a problem, it won't be able to handle all the traffic, things will just be worse.

Q. Is this in the Model Cities plan or just the Wellington-Harrington?

A. Both have the same plan.

(This is incorrect, as MC has no physical plan for area, nor has it even considered one. It is nowhere near the stage of such specific planning.)

Q. What would you like seen done for the whole area?

A. It needs rehabilitation. If it's left standing in 15-20 years there won't be much left. One of the things I object to is when the tourist comes into Cambridge from the outside -- East Cambridge is so bad, up to Inman Square there's nothing nice -- they get a bad impression." Speaking of Model Cities, she said "they haven't gotten started. In most of these programs the politicians end up getting most of the money - though I understand this is not happening at Model Cities - but they just keep talking and holding meetings and the longer this goes on the more they have to pay these people. But the federal government is employing people in Cambridge and that's not bad."

She accepts the political process as legitimate and effective given that politicians usually use the money for their own ends. She also seems to differentiate between resident control and resident participation, feeling that the former would not be effective because residents aren't competent to make technical decisions. Such a view illustrates the professionals' failure to make himself truly an adviser and not a policy maker:

Q. What do you think of resident control?

A. If it keeps the politicians out of the money, good. But if it's not it's wasted. I think most of the people (on the board) are incompetent, just like I would be. What do we know about engineering? If they hire a staff, ok. If they keep it clean it will be good."

Attending meetings are extremely inconvenient for her as she does not live in Cambridge and has no car. She takes care of her elderly mother; little internal motivation to participate seems to be present. Nor does she have some specific goal which will benefit herself. Already her property is to be taken by the Redevelopment Authority. Her motivation, an external one, seems a genuine interest in making Cambridge more attractive and providing the low income and elderly people with better housing. Before taking over her father's store she was a clerk elsewhere. She is a first generation American, economically just managing. She could not be classified as either downwardly mobile or middle class. Her participation has not been strong and one can question whether such abstracted goals are sufficient to motivate persons who have strong demands made on their time and energy as she has. We will examine later her exact reasons for low participation and see if attitudes or structures could be changed to encourage her participation.



## 8. Non Participants (Li Ix)

In contrast to the groups mentioned above, all who are considered to be positively inclined to participate, the following represent those groups for whom participation is not a consideration for them as private citizens. One common reason for this, suggested before, is that they are "alienated" from the political system, they have no faith that it can or will work for them. Such a view is expressed by a truck driver I interviewed who lives on Elm Street, the proposed route for the Inner Belt. This was the only successful interview conducted on this block, which is the proposed route of the Inner Belt. Most apartments were not occupied at the time (9:30-10:30 A.M.) and those that did answer usually would not open the door but ask who was out there and when I replied with my name and statement that I would like to talk about the Model Cities program, answered they weren't interested - 'didn't have the time'. This may be due to a general feeling of discouragement caused by "The Belt," as enunciated by this man.

Far more than most, an external situation exists which should provide sufficient motivation for participation but for him:

"The Model Cities is a pile of crap. Look what they did over on Charles St., tore down a lot of good houses and kicked a lot of people out so they could build apartments for the idle rich. What's the good of that? It's all for the politicians; they line their pockets. They talk about a Model City but where are the 6000 people gonna live if that road comes through here. That kid over there bought that house and has done a lot to fix it up, now what's gonna happen to him? Are they gonna give him the

"assessed value"? People just want to be left alone. Where else you gonna find an apartment that rents like this - elsewhere you pay a lot more for the same thing. Have you ever tried to find an apartment with six kids?"

"A lot of people on the street go to meetings and demonstrations (about the Inner Belt) but they just talk and talk, and the politicians pacify them." In any case he couldn't attend because he worked nights. He did have a suggestion for what might be done: "Clean up the streets. This street has been cleaned once, no twice, in the 11 years I've been here. That storm drain is always plugged," pointing to the road.

While he clearly perceives his problem(s) he does not see the political process as effective. He has no faith in the politician and it seems irrelevant for him to look to the political world for solutions to problems, of housing for instance. Problems at this end of society are basically economic; outside the framework of politics.

While he evidences little tolerance for the tedium of meetings, it is by no means clear that this is due to an inability to forego present satisfaction for future reward, i.e. loss of a night bowling with the boys for future solution to his housing/income problem. He seems to scorn those who attend the meetings for an unrealistic appraisal of the political reality. The politicians are the servants of the rich, he and his neighbors are not rich. They cannot hope to be fairly represented by the politician. No small part of the tedium, no small part of the indignation stems from the knowledge that your time and energy go for nought, but to divert and

distract, while plans continue as usual, that in short the poor are being "gulled".

A distinction in discussing internal motivation must be made between a general sense of personal power and efficacy and this sense as derived from the process of political participation. There was little to warrant in the truck driver's manner, attitude or response in his conversation with me that he felt himself an impotent or inadequate man. His response does indicate that he feels he can gain no sense of self or power through the political process of participation.

Using his example, the West End, one can say that his is not an irrational or misguided evaluation, based on limited education, poor leadership, or limited experience, all reasons cited for the essentially negative, non-constructive approach that middle class and professional people ascribe to those who put obstacles in the path of their planning. While the tone of such planning may have changed, that is the rhetoric, certainly the substance remains the same. For testimony one need go no further than the issue which threatens him now - the murky premises of the Inner Belt and its opportunities for valid participation by those most directly affected.

Another respondent who does not consider herself as a person who would participate in the Model Cities program or a like program is Aggie:

"The way I first heard about the program was when the trucks were going down the street. They had voting at the school last June. No, I haven't spoken about this (MC) with friends I don't believe it is worth it - They won't do anything. I didn't vote, its ridiculous to vote on some

thing you don't know anything about. My husband was in the hospital, we both have had Lubar pneumonia, first I and then him. I've had to take care of him, so we didn't have too much interest in it, to tell the truth. What with that and the fact that I work nights at the Boston Garden, in the winter and at Fenway Park in the summer - I played prosoft ball for twenty years - I don't go to meetings.

The questionnaire asked so many questions I really didn't know what it was all about. I'm not intelligent enough to understand those big words - you have to be a college graduate to answer them. I don't even understand what a Model City is. What is it?

I don't think it can do anything - if they want to make Model Cities it will be a beautiful place, but the prices will go up. It won't do anything for the old; it's for the young. We're speaking for most people over sixty. These programs aren't interested in the poor people. They don't pay any attention to us. I don't trust this - MIT and Harvard are driving up the rents - 8 Harvard students get together and pay \$15. apiece, and how can we compete with them? Where do the older people stand?

If they want more people to participate they should make it so you join an organization where everybody could come to meetings. I didn't go to the meetings because of work and my husband being in the hospital, and I wasn't home when the man came around for voting."

Clearly her age, health, occupation, education and income are all factors in keeping her from participating. She has no external motivation because while like the truck driver she clearly perceives at least one problem - housing - and the effects university expansion has on that, she does not

feel that a Model Cities program will remedy this. It will in fact abet it by making it a beautiful place, thereby changing the housing market, driving up rents, and driving her out. Rightfully she sees the old as particularly vulnerable. For if the poor are little aided by society today the elderly poor are less so. What can existing programs (all that she has to go on) do for the aging, sick, low income person? Tied to age is health. Although Aggie has a fearless exhuberance, any internal motivation that might be engendered or satisfied by the meetings is not allowed to develop for it has no impetus from external motivation. Nor is it possible given her night job. Age and health moreover further diminish the chance that energies will be expended in the sometimes tedious rounds of meetings, and meetings which promise no relief are not normally rewarding.

Finally given her material situation and view of herself as not sufficiently educated to deal with such matters, it is clear that the program's approach in reaching Aggie was not sufficient. She has no inclination now to participate, but that does not mean that under different circumstances, ones approaching the more personal, she could not be engaged. However, unless one wishes to create an army of the dissatisfied, with rising expectations not met, there is little reason in recruiting persons to a program which cannot meet their needs. At this point, Aggie's needs in basic terms of health, housing and income may be beyond the limits of programs governmental or private. Yet programs continue and in their wake the professional to administer them, irrespective of their ultimate failure or success.

Both of the above see little reason to participate because those structuring the participation, the professionals, are serving interests different than their own, making the place a West End, or a "beautiful place," in either case working towards a goal which has minimally perceived rewards for them. However, it is not clear that under any circumstances such as a sufficient budget and real freedom from politicians, participation would still be seen as unattractive or irrelevant.

For Patsy, a fine looking pepper and salt haired Italian who runs a fruit and grovery store, it would be irrelevant. Patsy does not ascribe to total democracy, finding it less efficient and more bothersome than representative government.

"Why should I go to meetings to tell them what ought to be done for this neighborhood? I have my job. I work here all day, sometimes until 9 o'clock. That's their job. Why should I go do their job, after I've done my own? Look, those old people standing there across the road. They're standing in the sun because they have no place to go and their own rooms are no good. Anybody with any sense could see that they need somewhere to go - something should be done about them. If the politician was really doing his job he'd see that and do something."

In part then, Patsy sees politics as an occupation, to be carried out by certain people hopefully with the same effort and integrity with which he carries out his job. If one is a fruit store owner one is not a politician, and if one is a politician one does not get involved with Patsy's fruit store. He has low expectations of real benefit coming from a politician or professional, the two for him being tied together. The basic mistrust of all those not in the family, particularly those who

have greater power, observed in many ethnic groups such as the Italians is strong in Patsy. At best the government is something to avoid, the referee who steps in when a wrong is committed:

"No, why should I speak to them? I've never done anything wrong. I run a clean store. I've always paid my debts. If someone comes in here and wants to use the store for something bad, or is impolite, I ask them to go somewhere else. Why should I have to talk to government people?"

Those in power will use their power to put you in a dependency position. Patsy has some trouble with his teeth which he would like fixed, but he can't afford it. I have repeatedly tried to get him to call City Hall, and have offered to do it myself, feeling sure that some program such as medicaid would be open to him. But he is resistant to any such action. "I know Al (Vellucci, the city councillor), we're old friends, we've had good times together, but if I call City Hall, then everyone will know that I've done it and if they do a favor for you, then they'll expect something from you."

In the personalistic world of Patsy's politics, very much the old ethnic ward boss tradition, one only gets something in return for something, and Patsy values his sense of independence - of being beholden to no one - too strongly for that. He will minimize the distance between him and his government, he will pay his taxes and vote and hope that this will be sufficient to ward off meddlesome interference. As long as he does this he maintains for himself some balance of power, some "resident control" for he can "turn the rascals out" at election time. He sees the ballot as

a means of control. Patsy's distrust of the politician's motive, plus his heritage of ward politics where the individual politician does often take the time and energy to visit his constituents to see what they need. (I have spent a Saturday morning going around this area with Al Vellucci in his car, seeing it done, as he stopped to congratulate this person about a recent birth, confer with and go to the Dept. of Public Works to get a truck for another, or to inspect the newly bought apartment of a resident, all the while constantly returning waves and friendly shouts from passersby, leads him to prefer a representative style of democracy.)

And given the demands of time and energy made by a working man such as Patsy it is understandable. It raises questions, serious questions for any professional who claims that he wants citizen participation, let alone control. For irrespective of Patsy's suspicion, he is fully justified in questioning a system which shifts much of the responsibility measured for him in terms of time lost from either working or relaxing, and energy, too, from the officials shoulders to his own. If that system cannot give some reasonable evidence that it can do the job in a way more satisfactory for him, worth the extra effort, then he is justified in refusal and the professional is guilty of misleading his client, a form of incompetency at best and dishonesty at worst.

Citizen participation as envisioned by its proponents is a decided change from present decision making procedures. But both of the above groups reject it as a method for change, the one because of the unequal distribution of income and power they feel precludes any real power for



the poor, the other, aside from his innate suspicion, because he feels the concept of citizen participation is intrinsically less efficient. It does not appeal to him because of what are to him, unreasonable demands upon his energy and time. This latter view is a sobering thought to the professional recruiting citizens to a cause which does not effect him materially and of which the outcome is questionable. How much more of citizen participation's goals could be realized with more effort on the professional's part, of the nature of the old ward healers? If the existing government did its job well would there be a need for private citizens working overtime to readjust the order?

Real vs. Anticipated Response

The above categories were exemplified by persons whose participation was anticipated judged from their general view of themselves, the political process and past history of activity. Several of those who were judged in the participatory category did not participate, or dropped out after initial activity.

Let us examine their reasons:

In the first category - HiHx, Mrs. Fahy, the enthusiastic Scorpio, did not continue her participation for reasons familiar to any recruiter making the rounds of already identified potential participants: she was already overcommitted:

"I was in all the early Model Cities, all that wrote up the drafting, but when they had the elections and the meetings they always had them on nights when I had other meetings, and on Wednesday, the night of their meeting I work. I would just love to run but I knew I didn't have time. For once in my life I used my head."

Hers is a problem nearly insoluble for those hoping for increased participation. It would be necessary that she reorder her priorities so that the new program, in this case Model Cities, would take precedence. Because she was able to attend early meetings, it would seem not solely a question of time, but also that it interferes with her job. The motivation which needs to be stimulated is external, low sense of urgency with little material reward (in comparison with her job). Right now her job is able to reward her prime interest, education. A non-voluntary organization meets her internal motivation of duty and enjoyment

of political activity, with an external motivation, recognition of a need for the community, and supplants the Model Cities program. Until the economic opportunities of low income neighborhoods is upgraded considerably, freeing greater numbers of people for voluntary activity, this will be a problem.

Of more concern to the professional eliciting support and participation are the criticisms of Barbara Markunas, also in the category of persons highly motivated to participate. Her criticisms brought her to cease participating although she was one of the first people contacted. Her history, therefore, is worth recording:

"I first heard of it when President Kennedy...was it? made an announcement about Demonstration Cities. Then I heard about it through a W-H sponsored meeting on a diagnostic survey for the UR area which was being discussed by different agency people. Frank Colchord from the Joint Center was there and Alan McClelland brought it up. (Yes, this was before Justin Grey), but we didn't have any idea that Cambridge would be able to get it. Then Justin Grey called the members of the W-H board individually on the phone to explain the program and ask for our support and he took a number of us as well as others from the neighborhood to a meeting at Holy Cross in Worcester where people from Washington discussed the idea. Then after the preliminary application had been made -- I'm not sure of the exact chronology of all this -- Justin asked us to be ready to take a team from Washington through the area and tell them what we had learned about it. But this we only did no maps with them because they were behind schedule and didn't have time to actually see it. After that somebody from Justin's office came around and interviewed me asking me how to involve

people in Model Cities. I told him that they should send out teams of people going from door to door saturating the neighborhood with the information - hire neighborhood people to do this. This is when I began to go sour, for they decided to forego everything for 4 big area meetings. The public meetings were a farce. Justin started to loose me. He refused to give direction to the meetings. There was no feeling...no concrete way that things could be followed out and there were damned good suggestions from the audience. The meeting was left to those who knew the verbiage, the few who knew the terms, like myself. We probably said the same things we had said before, but "Joe Doaks" was afraid to speak.

He lost me completely the way he ran the referendum committee. Again the same knot of people saying the same things. There was no honest attempt to get new people. Justin pushed to get things down on paper and we used this paper like it was the Bible. There was no room for innovative thinking which was what everybody kept talking about. The day that the constitution was presented at a convention my son returned from Vietnam;- he had been missing during the Tet offensive so, for me the constitution went right out the window. But the form, it was ridiculous, it was a legal document which was all right, but after every article except one were the words "to be done." The only article which we had worked on was Article 4, which dealt with the size of the CDA and the representation and a few other things. He (Justin) got together with the lawyers from CLAO and put it together.

It's spoon feeding the people a lot of pap telling them they did it. I told him that it smacked of dishonesty and I thought he was less than professional. He asked me why I didn't stay on. It was the first time I worked with a professional and I've worked with them on many projects, who didn't treat me as a thinking individual. I've stood with a 5 year old, and patted them on the shoulder for making such a good cake, when it was really me who poured the ingredients in the bowl, too many times to not know when it's done to me. It may well have been that that's the way it had to be done. We needed legal assistance. But he tried to make us think that we had done it all. The other stuff that the lawyers did is the meat and potatoes of the problem. Just take a look at the ordinance, at the other stuff besides Article 4.

I've heard several professionals say that Justin runs roughshod over people, and that since he has been here they get very short shrift at City Hall. As soon as the rush job of getting the components in (for the proposal to Washington, D.C.) Justin Grey's door was closed to the professionals. But then after high-hatting everyone, he was in the same situation again this last winter, December, when he had to get the submission in. The professionals and the colleges came right back just to save the program. They swallowed their pride, and the people were right back where they had always been, with the professionals doing the work. This city was a madhouse."

Q. Do you think citizen participation can work?

"Why sure it can. But Justin was dedicated to the proposition..he was more intent in saying I, Justin Grey pulled off this coup, rather than getting a real cross section of people. Maybe I'm too ingenuous, too naive....

People who are shy don't have it in them to get out in public to go in stone cold. They are silenced by the people who have picked up a few terms, verbiage, but the others hear them and say to themselves well they must know what they're talking about, so they don't say anything even though those people may be talking through their hat. People are basically meek. They don't believe "we want YOU" means them, really. How to get participation? Basically he should have taken the group that knew something, who were begging to help him. I agreed a little with Ollie Brooks who said get them together in one room, provide plenty of coffee, lock the door and saturate them with information about Model Cities. Then send them out into the neighborhood and explain to every Joe Doakes that they live in Model Cities. Ask them what they want -- maybe he'd really want a heliport on his roof. We all know that the kids need a place to go, anyone in world can say that. Who knows? We might even find out that what people really want for the area is a whorehouse - there have been other places that have.

Normally not liking what was going on in Model Cities wouldn't deter me from participating. I didn't like Wellington-Harrington either, but Model Cities was a different cup of tea. We were fighting a deadline and what I didn't like was a fait accompli. There was nothing I could do about it. The time element was such that I couldn't do anything. Normally I like to fight people like this.....Things change you've got to keep an open mind.

One thing I think, I've been a good mother. When I look at my youngest

I think she's just a baby, but then I remember that I was married at 17 and she's 16 now. I knew what I was doing then, that there would be pitfalls ahead in getting married then, and so does she. I think you have to relate people in your immediate vicinity, your own home, to the rest of the world. Maybe I'm mother to the world. (Laughs). People ask me how I can praise those boys up in Canada, with two boys in the service. Well one of my boys was in Vietnam and I believe we should be there and he got the silver star, and I'm extremely proud of him, but it takes more courage to do what those boys are doing, if they sincerely believe in what they are doing, to go up there, than what my son did. That's all over now, he's home safe, but they are going to have to live with their decision for the rest of their lives. I admire them."

Her dissatisfactions are related both to internal and external motivation. Clearly she did not enjoy her exposure to a professional, Justin Grey, and any internal satisfaction derived from the process was greatly reduced if not replaced by discomfort. She felt that he was condescending and dishonest in his treatment of her and others in the program. His behavior displayed a greater interest in furthering himself than the concept of citizen participation, an experience many residents seem to be familiar with but one for her new, and therefore a shock.

Compounding this cost, in personal terms, was the strong dissatisfaction with the structure. As her case exemplifies, despite a strong awareness of problems and goals, if the structure cannot sustain the faith that it can deliver, support will probably be withdrawn. Barbara M. believes in

the concept of citizen participation, but feels that the structure did not allow it. It made no real effort to get beyond the circle of old hands like herself into the neighborhood. It gave insufficient attention to the hesitancy and fears of those not fluent in "the verbiage". In short it was geared to perpetuating the old leaders and the old ideas -- no heliport, no whorehouse for Cambridge.

Such of course was doubly galling because she felt that Justin Grey was not wedded to the concept and was hypocritical when he congratulated them for the very things she felt were missing from the program -- real control leading to real innovation.

When she felt that it was a fait accompli because of the Federal deadline and she could not change anything, she withdrew and has had nothing to do with the program since.

If her objective criticisms of structure are only individual to her personal resentment, if the style of one man, acting as rationalizations for it, then there is little than can be said in prescribing alternatives for future administrators. In every such structure personal differences will spring up. However, such differences as are in evidence here may partially be due to the tensions in working with people of different background, class, and experience. Those criticisms which are directed at what is seen to be patronizing or condescending attitudes on Grey's part may in fact be the result of a sensitivity of a highly capable and experienced woman, used to working on tasks with professionals, and used to assuming responsibility. The majority of residents with whom Grey was dealing did not have her experience and he may well have feared to use his direction to place certain persons in positions of greater



responsibility than others, given the strong sense of equality which the group held as part of citizen participation. They were very conscious of creating a new elite, unless that elite could pass the test of being "one of them". Barbara M. was not one of the "poor" and this could have some bearing. The defensiveness, the obstructionist nature of the poor which the professional so decries in trying to work with them certainly is not just his imagination, but it is hoped to be clear by now that it is not without reason, and must be dealt with constructively. (Grey may have done this consciously making a choice, of who was his client.)

One possible solution is for the professional to set up structures which can use people at different levels of expertise, as she advised - use those with experience to give others experience. Her specific recommendation (to saturate the neighborhood) would not run counter to citizen control, for far more than the four meetings which was the process decided on, informal contact by people of the neighborhood, is true to the resident participation concept.

But from the vantage point of hindsight, her objections seem valid, for at this point very few people in the neighborhood have any sense of awareness of what the program is doing, let alone a sense of control. Basically, this can be extended by lack of sufficient communication with the neighborhood; little community organization of the nature she described, little of a kind that goes beyond an occasional public meeting has taken place. This will be clear when the criticisms of other non-participants are considered.

Like her cohort at Tutoring Plus Mrs. Fahy, Barbara Askins although active in the initial early phase of Model Cities (running ninth for one of eight positions on the CDA board) has had little role in the continued planning of the program.

"I've gone to very few Model Cities meetings. They're like a hodge-podge. They have played personalities among each other, on the board. I never thought picayune personalities would show up -- they're adults showing how stupid and childish they are. It happens more with the woman than the men. I positively think it went to their heads. Hey, look - I know these girls, I've been on boards with them. They like you one minute and are against you the next.

I could see this for Fran (Hayes, who has plans to run for city council), who wants to go on to bigger things. I think a lot of them did it to make themselves big names - not to do something for the neighborhood. I was concerned with education and housing.

I heard about MC almost two years ago - they hired buses to take us up to City Council when Justin Grey was presenting it. I went to a meeting at the Margaret Fuller House. I thought it was especially good when I heard about resident control. It doesn't have much any more. Board runs it. You can't get people to come out.

I get the feeling that they (CDA) sit and wait for you to make an opinion and then they charge you."

"Now I'm not involved. I'm disgusted with the educational proposal, education is tossed aside, they tossed out all the outstanding educational factors, which is an outstanding problem for this area. Possibly its turning into a political thing. Might be able to do something about it if I went and made a big enough noise, or more people went to represent the program (Tutoring Plus and education in the area). They don't like to hear one person, do they? That clique in Area 4 is still going strong, new faces are needed. A lot of people in the projects don't get involved about the education. I guess they think it's a lost cause.

I don't know whether I'd run again, I'd have to see what comes out of it in the next few months. I haven't seen what they have done. I'm next on the list if someone drops out, and I;d go on it. I'd feel obligated.

Resident control is a great thing if they really get...yeah, it's possible. They got a good vote on the referendum, even the last time on the referendum (the ref. on the proposal to Washington). They did better than the council elections didn't they? I think so. The council said we'd be lucky to get 1,000 votes, and we got what, 2,700?".

Earlier she was placed in the category HiMx - her personality enjoys public participation and is apt to cause her to seek out issues. Her criticisms seem to correspond in some way to this evaluation. She does have some serious criticisms of the structure and program. She feels they overlooked her area of interest, education, and she is seriously

disturbed by the lack of participation, the lack of new faces.

She ascribes much of the inability of the board to do anything to their inability to get beyond personality differences to a discussion of substantive issues. But none of these things are irremediable; she still believes in citizen control. The reasons that she does not make the "big enough noise" to change the things she objects to are twofold: basically she senses an antagonism, or resistance to people like herself making suggestions or criticisms - "They don't seem to want to hear one person, do they?" The 'political', in this sense a pejorative symbol for personal in-fighting, it seems, and antagonistic nature of the board creates an atmosphere which confer no personal benefits on her, inasmuch as they are unpleasant, they are a cost. Secondly the external motivation, recognition of the area's educational problems, is not strong enough to overcome that cost. For she can satisfy that goal through her present activity at Tutoring Plus. The Model Cities program, if attractive, would serve to meet that need, but presently it is ancillary to on-going activities which already meet that need. Thus, in order to achieve some primacy in her set of activities, it must provide some internal satisfaction, which it was not able to do.

Esther, in the same category as Barbara A. (HiMx) has similar complaints - that channels of communication are closed off for all but a small group:

Q. Are you happy about what they are doing now?

"To be honest I haven't kept up, but in a way, no. I know of one meeting, there were complaints about not hearing anything and the board claimed

mailing problems, but they have all that money. You get a feeling like your being used because the only time you hear from them is when they want to fight something. They aren't spreading out at all. It's only if you know the right people that you hear anything. So now people are saying to heck with it the only time you hear about it is to vote. I don't think most of the people who voted know what's going on. I do because I know who to call but the rest don't.

I feel that on the board everyone is out for himself. They aren't sticking together, they're playing personalities. If they like you they will vote with you. Rev. Graham stated that he was sick of having a lot of money but none of it going to the neighborhood. You hear that people on the board are getting money - whenever you get money it ruins things."

Although she more than most enjoys the social, non-goal-oriented aspects of participation, she too has ceased to participate because the structure creates barriers through poor communication which are costly to overcome, and that this seems to be for a reason: that the board is afraid to share its authority and power.

Because she is not, like the homeowners, primarily concerned with some external problem, such as keeping the property values up, her criticisms are directed at the process. When it does not function, her participation decreases.

The storeowner quoted earlier in the category of  $L_1M_x$  did not continue

her participation either, and for not dissimilar reasons. She has strong ideas of what should be done to the area and she attended the first meeting. But there she felt hostility: "They were downing landlords, using it as a dirty word" and her attitude now is shown by this exchange: "It's been a waste of time. I have an elderly mother at home who takes care of herself pretty well, but I still have to clean the house and things when I get home. I'm out of the house here at the store 60 hours a week. I'd have to bother someone to drive me back here. If I felt something definite were taking shape in one form or another; I can't see what they have in mind for this area."

She has little personal interest in attending meetings, but what there might be is nullified by the hostility met there. The cost in time and energy in attendance is not outweighed by a reasonable indication that what she would like for the area will be implemented; she can't see what they have in mind for the area. Since she has stopped going to meetings, no great effort has been made to keep her informed. She is generally critical of the communication:

"You can't just keep sending it (necessary information) out to people. Not with these people. I know them. My parents were immigrants. I've grown up seeing their problems and they're my renters. They come down to me with this information, wanting to know what it means. They don't know English and they can't do much. Upstairs is a French Canadian, 81 years old. Another old man waits for his check to come and then gets drunk. Many of these people who live here are Portuguese from the Azores or

Santa Maria. This is the first place they come to, some friend has told them often we've been lucky, as no one who has been in this country for a while would live under these conditions. It's all cold water flats and the man from the Redevelopment Authority told us not to make any repairs because the building is slated to go. As soon as they get settled a little they move to some place so cheap - otherwise some of these people would have nowhere to go. That's why they should build some nice buildings for low income families here rather than just use it for parking."

Some important conclusions about participation can be drawn from this: If contact is to be either to the indigent, ill-informed or to those whose motivation is marginal such as the store owner's it must be of a more personal nature. Contact by an occasional newsletter, or even a public meeting is not sufficient. Her remarks however should be a warning that no kind of contact might be sufficient to engender participation at the lowest levels of income, for that population is marked by increasing transience and physical and social problems of survival that demand all their energy.

The group typified as "Middle America", those who had doubts, who had not strongly committed themselves one way or another have by and large not participated. There is reason to argue that again, in good part this is due to communication. The one active participant of the four, M. Hanright, was drawn into the program not through connections created by the program itself but by personal associations; recall her "I don't know if I would have gotten involved if I hadn't known Mrs. Dankewitz -- maybe not though.

I know Mrs. Young (members of the CDA board). People have to have some personal contact, more apt to go." The other three (Ringrose, Mrs. Bryzinski and Oakley) do not have the contact, and the Model Cities Program has not created it. There has been no concerted effort to reach these people. Personal association is too random and arbitrary to serve as an effective mechanism by which people are drawn into participation. The structure must create explicit means by which it makes personal contacts throughout the area.

The final and most vehement opponent of the Model Cities Program is a sport: I didn't know how to classify her, but she serves as a reminder, if that be needed, that you can't make everybody happy no matter what you do:

I've know about it (Model Cities) from the first, about 2 years ago. No, Ive taken no active participation, I've had a lot of bad news lately -- my husband, then my sister, then my nephew died.

Approve of program?

I'm for it, provided City Council approves. I'm old now, my health doesn't permit me to participate. But (a little heatedly) I've done a lot for the city. I was a social worker in my day. Oh, yes. I voted against the Model Cities. Why? I don't like what's happening. Where is the authority gone? You may think me square, but you can put me down on this-- rebellion comes next, revolution, anarchy.

What made you vote against the Model Cities program?

I don't like to see them trying to go over the heads of City Council.

What makes you think they are trying to do this?

When they all get together like that what else would it mean? (This given with a clever and knowing smile.)



Other information volunteered was that the neighborhood was "no more what it used to be" -- probably true, and that she was moving out. She didn't feel that much would be done for those like herself, elderly, her reaction being "try and get it". Whether this was due to her general pessimism or specific experience as a social worker was not explored. She did offer a specific wish that the sewer pipes be fixed. Every time there was a storm, water backed up in her bathroom.

#### IV. OTHER GROUPS NOT MENTIONED

Without recourse to statistical sampling, certain patterns are evident to any person who spends some time observing participation groups of the kind we are speaking of. Usually there is a preponderance of women; this holds true for participation in the Model Cities Program, both for numbers and influence exerted. (Although there was a strong conscious will to elect men to the board, and to elect a man as chairman, the most influential resident members, in terms of support they wield or threaten to wield, are women.)

Participation offers for the woman a chance to escape from the house and a social purpose during the day, that the job for a man in part satisfies and in part due to time, does not allow. Men are able to develop a sense of worth, or recognition from their peers during or through work; women in the home are more isolated. It is more common for men to develop social relations, friendships from either similarities of interest in work or socially recognized play (i.e. sports). While several women spoke of education, and some evidence obvious interest in the power and recognition they received, this was absent in the men. While we cannot be sure that these differences were only the result of an insufficient sample, it raises the question of whether men in low income areas fulfill their need for responsibility through their work and their sense of power through their social life - sports, fraternal organizations, etc.

The truck driver may well be able to express his sense of power and efficacy through softball, but this avenue is closed for his wife;

hence her search leads in other directions, possibly towards community concerns. Nor may this role expression differentiated by sex be coincidental. "Husbands who had the most segregated role relationships with their wives had manual occupations, and the husbands who had the most joint role relationships with their wives were professional or semi-professional people."<sup>23</sup>

The lower class male may be inhibited from participating in activities in which large numbers of women are active. Labor unions have strongly resisted attempts to form women's auxiliaries.<sup>24</sup> If females are active in participant groups, males may not be. The lower class male may separate political power from personal power, categories often looked upon as synonymous by the middle class, and inherent in any activity which promotes this sense of personal power for him may be the absence of women (apart from sex, which often does not allow the wife a participant role, and does not have a high degree of mutuality.<sup>25</sup> It can be hypothesized that by necessity, the lower class male makes a distinction between personal power and political power when searching for means of expressing and confirming self. The truck driver for instance may well be able to express his sense of

---

23. Alan F. Blum, Social Structure, Social Class, and Participation in Primary Relationships, cited in Blue Collar World, op. cit., p. 198.

24. Patricia, Cayo Saxton, Wife of the Happy Worker, in Blue Collar World, op. cit., pp. 81-88.

25. Lee Rainwater, Gerald Handel; Changing Family Roles in the Working Class, in Blue Collar World, op. cit., pp. 70-76, and Nathan Hervitz, Marital Strain in the Blue Collar Family, in Blue Collar World, op. cit., pp. 92-110.

power and efficacy bowling, but his wife may find the best way of receiving acclaim from her friends in the meeting.

Another category in which patterns emerge is age. The old for obvious reasons of lack of energy and strength and a diminished interest in the future have lower rates of participation. (But greater efforts than are presently made could be initiated to elicit and design roles for their participation.) The young heretofore have normally been left out. The Model Cities Program did make some successful effort to have the young student age people represented on this board, but the respondents did not speak on the point. Several spoke of the difficulties young women have, due specifically to children and family, as Barbara M did:

"Friends of mine, some don't participate. They physically can't. They have small children, their husbands don't like it. They have commitments at home, dinner to prepare. I was free to come and go quite early, because I started young with a family. So that now I am still quite young compared to many women who have the freedom. Friends of mine still have young children but plan to be active later.

V. COMMUNICATION PATTERNS

How did the respondents first learn of the Model Cities Program and which technique seemed most effective in generating an active response to the program? Of the twenty-two interviewed, nineteen were able to recall the means by which they acquired an initial awareness of the program.

Formal Communication: Five respondents mentioned a form of the mass media and two that of mass publicity by the Model Cities structure. Of the mass media two recalled the early announcement of Johnson's (when it was Demonstration Cities) and three mentioned the local newspapers (Cambridge Chronicle or the Record American). Two people stated that they first heard about it from the sound trucks sponsored by the Model Cities program, none mentioned fliers or signs which the program issued through the neighborhood as the means by which they first learned of the program.

Initial awareness is not the same as effectuating response. The two respondents (6,19),<sup>26</sup> reading of the national decision, obviously did not on that basis decide to participate in the Cambridge Model Cities: at that point there was no such organization. Both in fact mentioned a personal contact as the means by which they learned of the first meeting which they respectively attended. The information afforded by the local papers was more apt to generate action as it provided precise information of meetings, their content and schedule.

---

26. Cf. Appendix II.

One of the respondents (9) has not participated, one is a full participant (11) but whose participation can be traced to his organizational affiliation, and the third (18) did respond on the basis of the newspaper information.

How effective were the efforts of the structure itself to spread information and elicit participation? Two people cited the sound truck which announced the vote for the referendum and election of the CDA board. One of these (20) has been a participant but her participation is attributed to the involvement of a friend.

The written literature put out by Model Cities was not helpful: "The first piece of literature I ever got from MC was a thing with writing on both sides and a map on the bottom with a lot of fine print like on an insurance policy. How many people bother to read a thing like that through? If they want people to participate they shouldn't send this out. It will go right in the ash can. People will look at it, see Model Cities, but won't read farther and throw it away."

Also will be recalled the negative response of the store owner to the usefulness of written material for her tenants, in arousing interest or even awareness.

The audial and the highly visual are more effective than the "insurance policy": "The people in this area like to be shown something. We proved that at the unveiling of the Sennott Park plan. If they want participation they should put up a billboard down at Sennott Park showing what the area is going to look like. Then you'll get hundreds

of people."

Nine respondents cited informal patterns as the means by which they were first made aware of the MC program. This category includes other organizations: the poverty agency (3 respondents), the settlement houses (2 respondents), block clubs (2 respondents), an urban renewal citizens committee (1 respondent), and personal contact directly from a staff member of the MC program. None mentioned friends as first source, although, as indicated, friendship did account for involvement. All of the informal sources were trouble to an organizational structure which disseminated this information as part of its on-going activities. By their nature -- poverty program, settlement house, or block club, contact when made through them, is normally with persons already involved. Therefore it is unclear whether communication through organizations per se is effective or whether this depends heavily on the nature of the organization. But since it has been shown that the type of organization to which the lower class is apt to belong is church related, fraternal, or social in nature as opposed to civic organizations,<sup>1</sup> an attempt to make contact with these types of organizations should always be made, preferably by someone already in the organization.

Three people (3, 4, 10) had not heard of the program and naturally had not participated.

Personal contact proved more pervasive in providing initial information and much more effective in generating participation. Formal means seemed marginal in effectiveness.

## VI. CONCLUSION

The establishment and continuation of the participation which is represented by the interviews in this study is in itself a first step towards refuting the belief that people in poor neighborhoods

"Can be organized only under special circumstances and for special purposes. Except for organizations which are in some sense extensions of the family and the church, lower income neighborhoods are more likely to produce collective action in response to threats (real or imagined) than to create opportunities."<sup>1</sup>

Not being statistically representative the study can tell us little about who participated in contrast to who did not, nor which type in terms of class, S.E.S. or life style predominated in which group.<sup>2</sup>

We still do not know in terms of groups which persons would participate under no circumstances, which would only react to crisis and which would be predisposed to participate under "normally favorable" circumstances, although the views expressed in this study suggested hypotheses. A short answer survey based on what seemed important variables (age, sex, occupation, ethnicity and sense of political efficacy) relevant to participation could be designed from such evidence.

The study does tell us something aore about those people who are predisposed to participate and what is important to them if they are to

---

1. James Q. Wilson, op. cit., p. 414.

2. Although the strong representation of the housing projects mentioned by several of those interviewed (usually homeowners) tends to dispel the hypothesis that such participation is sustained by the middle class persons living in the area or by solely the downwardly mobile.



function with regularity in the organization. And it allows us to make a distinction in discussing why people do not participate between perception of what is a generalized good for the community, and the perception of effectiveness which one has in achieving that generalized good. It is an oversimplification of the life style explanation of non-participation which, noting the objective lack of low rates of participation on the part of the lower class, attributed it to a value system which does not perceive community wide goals such as parks or clear streets necessarily as "good".<sup>3</sup>

By this analysis to perceive is to act. Aggie or the truck driver could speak of community needs such as street maintenance or low income housing (which if disputed as a community wide goal speaks only of one's definition of "community," and not very favorably). That they did not participate is to be explained not by lack of community values which prevented them from seeing such needs, but by their perception of political efficacy, power. This is true, too, generally for those who categorically would not participate. In this case then participation was dependent upon the perception of the structure: did it have the power to do what it said it would, or did it say that it would do what the respondent recognized as the problem. The latter in no little way depends upon the communication which the organization establishes, the former on its performance.

---

3. H. Gans' Urban Villagers indicates that the residents in the West End did have a value system which placed low priority in exterior appearance while emphasizing the interiors of living spaces. But again this does not preclude recognizing the need for better schools, road repair, etc.

If the necessity of having some generalized non crisis oriented goal is necessary for effective participation and this study indicates that it is not, it still would not preclude large numbers of people from participating. Most people do perceive changes, however pedestrian, that they would like in their community. The more relevant question lies in how strongly they are motivated to work for those goals, and that appears to be dependant upon other factors besides how imperative one holds a particular goal to be. The category termed internal motivation was highly significant in determining participation, particularly for those who initiated but did not continue participation - an important group for any organization depending upon participation for effectiveness. All those who were sporadic in their participation could define some rational end goal which they would like the organization to promote. It was lack of sufficient communication contact, which caused dissatisfaction of a majority. Little real effort was made to bring those already interested into the discussion, let alone build up organizations in uninformed areas of the neighborhood, which could involve new people.

Nor were those who participated free of some doubts or suspicion expressed by nonparticipants that the organization could or would want to meet their needs. But particularly in a lower class area the personal relationships and the enjoyment of process may be able to compensate for the lower chances of success to be expected of a less powerful group. That is, there is a trade off of a more immediate reward garnered from the process, accepted in lieu of some future goal whose realization is problematic. For the person with a nonspecific

goal such as "better education" there may be several organizations through which such a goal may be pursued - attendance at or participation in school board meetings, membership in the P.T.A. (or like organization, which do exist in many low Y neighborhoods), or a neighborhood activated group such as Tutoring Plus. Thus the attraction of the organization may depend upon how it supports internal motivation.

Interestingly enough, this present oriented or shortened time horizon, when augmenting internal motivation, is more applicable for the non-specific goal oriented group than for the crisis oriented group which is not interested in process but in results. Goal orientation, a future time horizon and good planning need not be synonymous, and conversely present tense orientation (in terms of motivation) does not preclude good planning in terms of goals.

The importance of personal relationships must be particularly stressed for an organization which is made up of the lower class:

"The model for all social relationships (among the lower class) is the family; that is, social interaction with others tends to be on a highly personal or primary basis. There is a shallow and minimum commitment to the more impersonal or secondary relationships demanded in most spheres of a complex society."<sup>4</sup>

In concert with this emphasis on personal relationships was the frequent reference to the professional as a cause for distaste, generating suspicion and hostility for the organization in question. One cause is traceable to "style": the professional consciously operating within

---

4. Hausknect, op. cit., p. 209.

a framework of secondary relationships. To some extent this may be unavoidable, even necessary. (It was seen that those members of the board who operated more effectively developed a constituency which separated them somewhat from the responsibility of the single decision makers operating without external direction.) But, too, this suspicion has a basis in "fact". The professional works within, represents and is rewarded by a system which has been largely uninterested and unable to solve the problems of the poor, satisfying itself, but further alienating the poor with the explanation that plight of the poor is of their own doing (and, thus, is up to them for 'undoing'). The professional even if his intentions are good is effectively hamstrung from solving the major problems of the poor because the mechanisms which he pushes and pulls are inadequate to the task.

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNERS

The emphasis and means of communications as a first priority must be explicitly acknowledged by anyone who plans to operate an organization which depends on citizen participation. An effective community organizing staff must be integral to the effort; one which can make contact in the community block by block. Preparation which can assess the strengths and weaknesses of a community in terms of rates of participation can be both informal and formal. Social workers and politicians in city hall have a great deal of knowledge about the peculiarities of different areas such as power and nature of local organizations, church affiliation, leaders, etc. (Though not all will be willing to part with hard won information, especially to an

organization which at some future time may challenge their power.) Normally the census data, in detailing age, income, ethnicity, and housing stock, can be a good predictor of rates of participation and issues of concern. Finally of course the professional should spend what will seem an inordinate amount of time coursing through the neighborhood, talking with the Patsy's and the Aggie's. He should take a leaf from the word healer and the successful boss of an earlier era. If it is desired that the average citizen take a personal interest in a community planning organization, he should have some indicators that it has a personal interest in him.

The above is concerned with generating awareness and establishing contact. As was shown in the interviews, maintaining contact was a problem. The structure of the organization did not encourage participation again because of lack of communication, but also because of tension caused by role relationships - professional vs. resident, primary vs. secondary modes of relating. Left to work its will, such tensions could prove fatal: one outcome could be complete disavowal of all responsibility on the part of the residents due to spite and frustration, leaving all responsibility to the professional staff. This would increase or confirm the low income neighborhood's lack of faith in itself, and its cynicism about all participation. It is the responsibility of the professional to recognize the problem inherent in such tension and while accepting the necessity of a primary relationship basis for the structure, develop a structure which can respond appropriately rather than exacerbate it, as too often

happens today. Two examples from the Cambridge program will suffice. Because few of the residents on the CDA board, including the chairman, had previous experience in the procedure of large group meetings, the early meetings were disorganized, and confusing with several motions on the table at once, speakers out of turn, all leading to frayed nerves and exasperation, etc. To me as an observer, it was frustrating and must have been doubly so for those who were responsible, especially acting in public view. The professional staff's solution to this problem was to give every member of the board a copy of Roberts' Rules of Order and acquaint themselves thereby with the proper procedures. Such was the extent of the professional's support serving his client, in this case. Needless to say, I do not feel this either a sufficient or sensitive solution. It had little effect in ordering the meeting and in all probability heightened the insecurity of the board members who, assuming that for "capable" people, the book was sufficient to produce well-run meetings, made invidious comparisons concerning their own competence.

If the staff had recognized the importance of primary as opposed to secondary relations, and the basis for the difference in the group they had, much greater effort would have been given to studying group dynamics in order to develop group cooperation and greater effort expended in educating the group in a meaningful way, with personal contact, to the how's and why's of Roberts Rules.

A second example of lack of support exacerbated the insecurity and hostility that the members felt was over the question of whether

members who needed baby-sitters should be reimbursed. This represented some expense to the individuals concerned (but was obviously miniscule in terms of organizational expenditure); but, others, on the board who did not have children were afraid that this would look like graft to the people in the neighborhood and opposed it, causing some animosity in the group. The staff stayed on the sidelines giving little direction, allowed the wrangling to continue, wasting time, but more importantly, damaging future operating ability of the group, by building grudges. The staff, by pointing out how consulting firms, businesses and government agencies (such fees were specifically recommended by HUD for Model Cities participants), all met these kinds of payments and stating it publically with confident finality could have laid to rest any suspicions and relieved the board of possible accusation.

In both those cases the staff showed little awareness of the types of problems which his client was faced with; they judged and anticipated behavior and problems from their own patterns as a professional. If a professional is truly to serve his client, he must become familiar with their particularly nature, their strength and weakness so as to anticipate and correct the problems as they arise.

Such a statement argues heavily for community people with professional training in staff positions, able enough to appraise the situation and sensitive enough to respond to the neighborhoods needs and style.

In mentioning style I am not trying to reintroduce it by the back door

as the explanation for lower rates of participation among the poor, for I think as stated it is incorrect, overlooking the question of power which this paper has tried to make explicit. Thus one writer says:

"An association brings together individuals who are strangers to one another in more or less impersonal secondary relationships; their common bond is a specific interest. This requires of an individual a capacity to inhibit suspicion and hostility to others, and maintaining this attitude represents a severe strain on the tolerance of blue-collar persons."<sup>5</sup>

The reason given for this severe strain is that lower class persons relate to others on highly personal, particularistic terms: When an organization is trying to "influence the local power structure there is a tendency for the organization to become bureaucratic, and for impersonal social relationships to become the dominant mode,... "the businesslike" atmosphere of the pragmatic and efficient organization does not nourish primary relations... In such a situation those who construe the world in highly personal, particularistic terms have difficulty coping with authority."<sup>6</sup>

"Style", that is importance of primary relations cannot account for the hostility and suspicion which the author notes: This is due to past experience of the world they live in and seeing what those in secondary relationships did for them. To link primary relations and hostility or scorn together is slipshod and in this case, irresponsible.

Given that most can accept this distinction, still many will argue that secondary relationships arose from a certain need for efficiency, and that

---

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.



to operate in a different manner will so alter the " 'businesslike' atmosphere of the pragmatic and efficient organization" as to render the organization ineffectual. Some of this may be semantics - I ascribe a certain amount of the insensitivity, represented by the Roberts' Rules example as a too rigid definition of role, with little understanding of personal relations. Sensitivity to personal relations are not impossible to maintain within a role relationship, but such a relationship does not foster it. Efficiency can then be minimized, not maximized by such behavior.

As important as the pragmatic fact that impersonal bureaucratic procedures may be alien to lower class participants and therefore not conducive to continued participation is the question of its effectiveness as a structure for anyone: lower or middle class.

The end point of the faceless bureaucracy based on secondary relationships is alienation from self and society; a cost few are willing to pay for a benefit many doubt.<sup>7</sup>

Most analysts forecast the problems of the cities where the problems of the poor are increasing, as becoming more complex, and seem to feel that any solutions therefore must employ more complex methods. This in itself may be erroneous; it seems at least dangerous for it leads to increasing professionalism, and therefore a widening split between the citizen and the state decision makers. Because of their abstruse nature, managable by only a select few, the solutions become increasingly unlikely of representing a wide, relevant spectrum of opinion.

---

7. Altshuler's The City Planning Process, Ithica, Cornell University Press, 1965, in which he questions that the technical expertise of the planners has ever meaningfully widen the choices open to the public.

In planning a city for instance the whole may be the sum of its parts only if the parts receive first priority. That is comprehensive planning (planning for the whole) increasingly may be seen as ineffectual for any or many of its parts and that special interest planning, planning at the small scale with all its "inefficiency" may be the only tolerable solution.

We may have reached the stage in social planning that we have already reached in warfare planning, that our objective knowledge and technique carry us to a point of absurdity, i.e., destruction, so that we are forced to realize that such an "advance" cannot be taken, for it is in truth the ultimate regression.

Thus, although we may have the technical ability to make long range decisions, the process may be so disruptive of the social system, negating the basic assumptions of the democracy that it will provoke healthy rebellion, (as is already occurring on an objectively, small and incidental scale today). We may have to face certain of decisions, disavow our faith in technology and return to a "simpler", more tedious process by which people arrive at decisions which are basically short term, on a face to face basis.

Obviously self interest and like questions of representation must be handled and many times the decisions made will not be the "best" for the community. But a wrong decision arrived at by the people directly involved has a certain validity which a wrong decision arrived at by the professional lacks. What must be kept in mind is that wrong decisions will continue in

any system and that to predicate their eradication through a specific system is unrealistic. It is the design of a system which makes living with a wrong decision most tolerable that is important.

Still another criticism apt to be raised concerning the personal nature of lower class participation is the primacy which internal motivation plays. This does not seem susceptible of supporting meaningful participation, it is somehow not "legitimate". But in this study there was no evidence that either indicated a) external motivation precipitated "better" participation or b) that high internal motivation is inconsistent with high external motivation. Those most dependable were rated high in both areas. Within a low income neighborhood a high external motivation with low internal motivation is more likely to arrive from a crisis and be short term and particularistic in outlook. Model Cities is a non specific organization planning for the whole community, is representative of the type of organization planners will hope to be working with. The great majority of participants were not single issue or crisis oriented.

While some of those with high external motivation (Janet, for instance) saw the neighborhood threatened by encroachment by MIT and Harvard, the nature of involvement was not confined to the individual's particularly situation, it was aimed at creating opportunities for the community, dealing with problems other than purely economic such as health and education, and it was of effects which had extended over time - "future oriented."

But internal motivation was present often as in the case of Janet, to a high degree. It was a determining factor in the disengagement of participants with a medium to high external motivation (such as Barbara A., Barbara M. and Esther). By the same token given the nature of the motivation independent to some degree of the goal progress of the organization, participation can be readily reactivated if the structure were redesigned in a way that offered them internal rewards. Because organizations may have fairly generalized external goals several may be capable of satisfying this motivation. The organization which best satisfies the more present oriented internal motivation then receives the participation. Citizen participation groups which are built around the concept of resident control, have as this one did, a real attraction for those whose internal motivations are stimulated by the meaningful political activity which comes with some sense of power. As a structuring mechanism resident control is a powerful attraction, albeit it makes heavy demands on the professional (demands which he should welcome, however).

Internal motivation however reinforces external motivation: A dominant pattern observable in this study was a dynamic progression from an initial contact and participation whose foundation was personal, the motivation described as internal, to an awareness and acceptance of the program goals of the organization, resulting in a sound external motivation. No participants were classified as HiLx though the respondent so classified was a potential participant and for good reason. Such a category was designated as "unstable" for once participation is undertaken the rationale of the

organization is to some extent either positively or negatively internalized to make the participants behavior rational and congruent both to himself and the other members of the group. Hence it seems likely to me that those who are in Hi Mx could have been like the potential participant HiLx, and having joined, gained some external motivation as a product of continued participation. Rita and possibly Pat fit this pattern, and the progression continues, the line dividing them from Mx and Hx is now rather arbitrary.

The explanation for this is that participation itself educates: socially, politically and administratively. As participation continues ones' sphere of awareness, the levels of community to which one must respond, increases. Such is a commonplace; it is one reason stated why the middle class is apt to have less issue oriented more far ranging goals. Yet somehow, when the lower class is considered, the treatment seems static; their ability to assimilate new information seems to be taken as nil.

In fact the lower class is susceptible to such a process of growth and change, and of considerable magnitude. As Janet said, "You wouldn't believe it, eight years ago I was afraid to go to City Hall --- I was completely uninvolved."

This is not to say that every person who joins for some internal motivation will take on more external motivations and become a HiHx who is an effective participant. Obviously some don't internalize the goals, the goals don't interest them, and they look elsewhere for their psychic rewards. What it

does say is that people who originally have little sense of community wide questions or problems which extend over time, may become sensitive to these questions and develop a desire to work for them. The awareness upon which external motivation of a non-crisis nature is based moreover is not likely to be extinguished once acquired. As knowledge, it is not contingent upon activity. The motivation to act which it engenders may cease due to cynicism or frustration brought about by inability of the existing structures but consciousness of the problem will remain. Revived motivation then becomes a factor of structural change.

If internal motivation is a crucial variable in the participation of those who are predisposed to participate, it is not the vital factor for those who decline to participate. Here it would seem factors relating to external motivation hold sway, the crucial determinant being the ability of an organization to meet real needs: its power. This determinant affects by far the larger number of people and must be confronted by anyone seriously considering enlisting citizen participation in a planning program.

If a structure is intent on overcoming the hostility and suspicion of a large number of the poor it must make clear that it has power comensurate with the goals it defines. Resident control provides an attractive mechanism for the implementation of a program but it, by itself, is not the source of power-which to most residents is most clearly represented by money. (In this respect the Model Cities Program by having money has a legitimacy, a power, which few programs involving the organization of the poor have had to date.)

To some extent, probably quite major, power and the control of that power will define the type of participation engendered. As the power rises so should participation -- given that the goals are reflective of the needs of the poor. For if the goals are sharply limited in nature, so will be the rate and quality of participation. Those attracted must be willing to expend large time and energy for small rewards and thus their interest must in some sense be personally motivated. And the nature of the goals does not allow for this type of progression and education described earlier as easily as an organization less closely bound.

A professional in judging the capacity of his organization to promote participation must regard the behavior of the poor as if their decision to participate was a rational one based on the ability of the organization to meet their objective material needs.

As the power increases or decreases so will the goals of the organization and the rate and type of participation. When the power is minimal, goals will be small and those who participate will either be motivated largely by internal motivation, or will be concerned with maintaining the status quo or making minor changes. The established structure will be willing to meet and deal with such a group since the demands upon its resources are minimal. The behavior on both sides can then be described as "reasonable"; neither side gains by being obstructionist. Naturally however, such a situation is not going to attract the majority of the residents in a poor income neighborhood. It is not to their benefit to maintain the status quo.

The closer the aims of the group and the structure from which it grants the demands, the greater the willingness on the part of the political structures to negotiate, but the less the numbers of lower class people who will participate. Conversely the greater the demands, made on the existing political structure the less chance of success, and thus again, the less willing will be the poor to participate. Only when the demands reflect their needs and the power is sufficient to get them, will the poor, like any other group, be willing to expend their resources on a large scale. This however, will introduce conflicts among the group, for organizations with power will attract those with limited as well as major demands, i.e., the homeowner concerned with maintaining the neighborhood, as well as the project person asking for low income housing. Those of limited demands will not be willing to make the large demands which can antagonize the political structure, because this will jeopardize their demands which can be gained through little or no conflict.

The organization must decide quite early who is its client. When its client are poor people, the professional has a special duty, doubly difficult for him as an operative in a role, (and probably also middle class) to establish structures which are sensitive to the importance of primary relationships and which is able to mitigate rather than exacerbate the problems arising from this situation.

The professional was seen as a prime target of censure and suspicion. This is due in part to the conflict inherent in his view of himself as a role player, while operating in a personalistic milieu. But also grave



suspicion is cast on the professional for class reasons--who does he really serve? How the professional can show his good faith and overcome the natural suspicion is a question not clearly answered in the interviews. To create mechanisms which can allow them to derive a personal sense of efficacy through the political process is the implicit need.

But just as it is possible that at this time the poor have no recourse to anything other than non-cooperation and disruption, it is possible that the professional, given the context of the solutions offered by the system, cannot truly serve his client, if that client is the poor person.

APPENDIX I

Cambridge Model Cities - Socio-Economic Characteristics<sup>1</sup>

<u>Item</u>	<u>City Total</u>	<u>M.C. Area</u>
Population Density		
Housing Units per acre	25.8	43.2
Per units overcrowded (more than one person per room)	7.2	12.7%
Family Income		
Total number of families	24,490	3,567
Total as % with less than \$3,000	15.3%	21.3%
Unemployment		
% males over 14 in labor force unemployed	4.1%	5.7%
Welfare		
% persons under 21 receiving ADC payments	1.2%	2.9%
% persons 65 and over receiving old age assistance	11.4%	20.9%

---

1. Data taken from Application to Department of Housing and Urban Development, Model Cities Planning Grant, pps. 11-12.

# APPENDIX II

## Interviews

<u>No.</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Full Participation</u>	<u>Sporadic</u>	<u>No Participation</u>
1	Aggie			Li Lx
2	Oakley			Mi Mx
3	Connie			Hi Lx
4	Patsy			Li Lx
5	Rita	Hi Mx		
6	Hat store owner		Li Mx	
7	Lorraine	Hi Hx		
8	"old square"		- non classifiable -	
9	Mrs. Bryzinski			Mi Mx
10	truck driver			Li Lx
11	Mike	Hi Hx		
12	Ester		Hi Mx	
13	Allan R.		Mi Mx	
14	Barbara A.		Hi Mx	
15	Janet	Hi Hi		
16	Pat		Hi Mx	
17	Mrs. Foley		Hi Hx	
18	Eva S.	Mi Hx		
19	Barbara M.		Hi Hx	
20	Mrs. Hanright	Mi Hx		
21	Mr. Spriros	Mi Hx		
22	Mrs. B.	This interview was not used as pressure from a jealous spouse, entering shortly after the interview began, caused me to question the validity of the response.		

Bibliography

1. Altschuler, Alan, The City Planning Process. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1965.
2. Banfield, Edward C., Political Influence. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1965.
3. Banfield, Edward C., and Martin Myerson, Politics, Planning and the Public Interest. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1955.
4. Banfield, Edward C., and James Q. Wilson, City Politics. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1965.
5. Dahl, Robert, Modern Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1963.
6. De Tocqueville, Alexis, Democracy in America. New York, Mentor Books, 1963.
7. Deutsch, Karl, The Nerves of Government; Models of Political Communication and Control. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
8. Dewey, John, The Public and its Problems. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1927.
9. Downs, Anthony, Inside Bureaucracy. Boston, Little Brown and Company, 1967.
10. Gans, Herbert, The Levittowners. New York, Pantheon Books, 1967.
11. Gerth, Hans, and C. Wright Mills, From Max Weber, Essays in Sociology. New York, Oxford University Press, 1958.
12. Glaser, Barney, and Anselm Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory; Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.
13. Greer, Scott, The Emerging City. New York, The Free Press, 1962.
14. Greer, Scott, Urban Renewal and American Cities. New York, Bobbs-Merrill, 1965.
15. Harrington, Michael, The Accidental Century. Baltimore, Penguin Books, 1966.
16. Hofstadter, Richard, The Age of Reform; From Bryan to F.D.R.. New York, Vintage Books, 1955.

17. Keyes, Langley M., The Rehabilitation Planning Game. Cambridge, The M.I.T. Press, 1969.
18. Kaminsky, Margie, Unpublished M.C.P. Thesis (M.I.T.), 1968.
19. Lane, Robert, Political Life. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
20. Laswell, Harold, Politics: who gets what, when, how. New York, Meriden Books, 1964.
21. Liebow, Elliott, Tally's Corner. Boston, Little Brown and Company, 1966.
22. Marris, Peter, and Martin Rien, Dilemmas of Social Reform. New York, Harper and Row, 1964.
23. Payne, Stanley, The Art of Asking Questions. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1963.
24. Reisman, David, Faces in the Crowd, Individual Studies in Character and Politics. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1964.
25. Rossi, Peter H., and Robert Dentler, The Politics of Urban Renewal. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
26. Shostak, A., and William Gomberg (eds.), Blue Collar World. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1964.
27. Spiegel, Hans B., ed., Citizen Participation in Urban Development. Vol. 1, Concepts and Issues. Washington, Center for Community Affairs, Institute for Applied Behavior Science, 1968.
28. Whyte, William F., Street Corner Society; The Social Structure of an Italian Slum. Second edition, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
29. Wilson, James Q., (ed.), Urban Renewal: The Record and the Controversy. Cambridge, The M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Articles, manuscripts, newspapers

1. "Application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development", Model Cities Planning Grant, Cambridge, 1967.
2. Arnstein, Sherry, "Citizen Participation - Rhetoric and Reality", unpublished manuscript.
3. Arnstein, Sherry, and Daniel Fox, "Developments Dynamics and Dilemmas", unpublished manuscript.

4. Cambridge Chronicle, intermittent, July 1968- May 1969.
5. "Columbia Manual on Qualitative Interviewing", New York, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1948.
6. G. Malefant, (ed.), "The New Citizen's Guide to Cambridge", Cambridge, no date.
7. Marshall, Dale Rodgers, "Who Participates in What?", Urban Affairs Quarterly, December 1968.
8. Peattie, Lisa R., "Reflections on Advocacy Planning", A.I.P. Journal, Volume 34, pp. 80-88.
9. Schmittberger's Testimony From New York Legislature, Senate, Police Department of New York Report and Proceedings, 1894.
10. Warren, Roland L., "The Interorganizational Field as a Focus of Investigation", unpublished manuscript.
11. Weiss, Robert, "Alternative Methods for Studying Complex Situations", Human Organization, Volume 25, number 3, Fall 1966, pp. 198-206.
12. Weiss, Robert, "Issues in Holistic Research", reprinted from Institutions and the Person, Becker et al. (eds.), Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1908.
13. Weiss, Robert, "Managing Alone", unpublished manuscript.